THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 12. MARCH, 1939. Vol. XXVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Archbishop Temple on Heresy and Hypocrisy.

In his recently published *Readings in St. John's Gospel*[1] Archbishop Temple writes:

> 'For the Church, commissioned to transmit to all generations the true doctrine which may elicit saving faith, heresy is more deadly than hypocrisy or even than conscious sin: but for the individual the one vital matter is personal trust, and accepted heresy in its effect upon his soul may be quite unimportant. There have been saintly heretics and orthodox worldlings. Vast confusion has arisen because men have not distinguished between the functions of the Church and of the individual believer in the economy of the divine purpose. To the Church heresy is more destructive than conscious sin; to the individual conscious sin is more destructive than heresy. . . .' (pp. 37-8).

The issues raised by this statement are of profound importance. The reader might jump to the conclusion that Dr. Temple is setting up two different standards of morality, one for the individual Christian and another for the Church. We cannot really believe that he is deliberately doing this. Others again might conclude that the Archbishop takes the view that hypocrisy, which seemed to our Lord one of the most detestable of vices, if not *the* most detestable, is a comparatively venial moral defect. Again, we are convinced that the Archbishop is a truth-loving man and that he really detests hypocrisy, whether in individuals or in institutions. But whether Dr. Temple's statement as cited

[1] Macmillans, 1939. 8/6.

in full, does, or does not, lend itself to misconstruction, at least we are convinced that the phrase in it, 'heresy is more deadly than hypocrisy,' will do a great deal of harm.

What is heresy? Heresy is the holding of false doctrine, and this is almost always combined with the propagation of it. How is false doctrine to be recognized? It will be answered: by comparing it with the dogmas of the Christian Church. Whatever differs from or contradicts traditional Church dogma is heretical. Heresies are great or small according as to whether they conflict with essential or non-essential Church traditional dogmas. For modern thinkers in this sphere three crucial difficulties arise:

(1) Church authorities are not agreed in their classification of essential and non-essential dogmas, *e.g.* whether belief in the Virgin Birth is essential or non-essential.

(2) Church authorities are not agreed as to the precise sense in which the definitions of various dogmas are to be interpreted. Some hold that they must be interpreted literally and in accordance with the precise meaning which the terms of definition had for those who originally defined the dogma, *e.g.* 'ascended into heaven,' 'descended into hell,' require belief that Jesus Christ actually went up from the earth's surface and also went down into the earth's interior. In brief, that heaven and hell in these dogmas are to be interpreted as localities, not as states or modes of existence. Others, however, maintain that these phrases may be rightly interpreted symbolically.

(3) Perhaps, however, the greatest difficulty in discovering what is heretical and what is not heretical is due to the modern recognition of the development of doctrine; so that dogmas which at one time were held and taught by those who were regarded as orthodox have been altered or abandoned at a later stage; *e.g.* it seems clear that St. Athanasius taught Apollinarianism. 'Static orthodoxy becomes heresy' is an epigram, but its truth is justified at the bar of Church history. This belief in the development of doctrine is in accordance with the conviction that the understanding of Christian truth, whether by the individual or by the Church as a whole, is a growing process and the fulfilment of Christ's promise: 'I have many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now, but when He the Spirit

of Truth is come, He shall guide you into all the truth.' This belief in the development of orthodoxy also fits in with the evolutionary faith of modern science and its conviction that the truth is more fully learnt by going forward than by going backward. For those who believe in the development of Christian doctrine there is not only the authorized orthodoxy of the past but also the unauthorized orthodoxy of the present and the potential orthodoxy of the future. These orthodoxies of the present and the future may be described as the trend of Christian thought arising from the augmentation of Christian experience; and often carry more weight for modern minds than the dogmatic conclusions of the past. One of the most original of Greek thinkers, Heracleitus, said 'All things flow'; and it is the ever-flowing current and continuity of Christian thinking which is supremely significant to-day for the enlightened Christian teacher.

In the light of these considerations we shall not be disposed to allow modern Christian thinking to be fettered by the dogmas of the Christian past. These dogmas are milestones in the progress of Christian thinking. They are not its goal.

No open-minded student of Church History can believe in the infallibility of the Church or in the infallibility of its dogma. All Church dogma is open to re-examination and, if necessary, to re-formulation in the light of divine inspiration and enlarging Christian experience. As a consequence, the term heresy has depreciated. There was a time when to be branded as a heretic filled Christian minds with horror and repulsion. To-day such charges recoil for the most part on the heads of those who make them. To-day we ask whether a Christian teacher or a Christian Church is sincere, enlightened, open-minded, truth-loving, truth-seeking. If they be such, it is assumed that they will also be truth-teaching, but not in any infallible or final sense, since the idea of infallibility or finality in this sphere is now regarded as absurd. With this changed outlook charges of heresy against a Church will be regarded as merely mediaeval and as characteristic of a bygone method of thinking about Christian truth and the duty of the Church as a teacher of it.

When however the Church to-day is charged, not with heresy, but with hypocrisy, all the horror and repulsion which was

aroused in the mediaeval mind by the charge of heresy will be aroused in the modern mind by the charge of hypocrisy. For hypocrisy is a deliberate sin against truth, prompted it may be by cowardice, or love of power, or some other vice, but clearly indicative that he who is guilty of it, or the institution which is guilty of it, does not love the truth whole-heartedly. In the *Book of the Revelation* (xxi, 8) the list of the damned is headed by the cowards and ends with all liars. The modern Christian spirit, like the modern scientific spirit, will place the hypocrites, whether individualist or institutional, in that list.

Can Archbishop Temple be conscious of the conclusions which many will feel compelled to draw from his statement that 'For the Church . . . heresy is more deadly than hypocrisy'? When the authors of the Doctrinal Report wrote (and the Archbishop himself was one of the Commission) that

> 'to admit acrimony in theological discussion is in itself more fundamentally heretical than any erroneous opinions upheld or condemned in the course of the discussion' (p. 23),

modern-minded men, whether Christian or non-Christian, recognized the affirmation of a great truth long obscured from the eyes of the Christian Church. They hailed it as the enunciation of a principle the practice of which must lead to the most beneficial results. But when the Archbishop affirms that for the Church, as the guardian and teacher of divine truth, 'heresy is more deadly than hypocrisy,' he has inadvertently (although this is not the first time he has said it) been led, so we are convinced, into a position which is as detrimental to the influence of the Christian Church in the modern world as it may prove to be to the cultivation of courageous truth-seeking and truth-speaking by the rank and file of the clergy. It is not an easy thing for the clergy in these dark and difficult days to be fearless truth-seekers and truth-speakers. Obscurantist reaction is closing in on many sides, and it is only because we fear that the words of the Archbishop will be almost certainly bound to be so interpreted as to lead many of the clergy to find an excuse for shunning the truth, both in thought and utterance, that we have felt compelled to criticize his statement.

Had Dr. Temple been satisfied to stress the importance of a Church commissioned to teach the truth being loyal to that commission; and had he further stressed that the disloyalty of an individual Christian to the truth is less serious for human welfare

than the disloyalty of the Church to the truth; had he further added that loyalty to the truth was so important that Christ Himself had died for it and that Christian martyrs true to His Spirit had done the same; had he further affirmed that loyalty to truth is a much larger and more exacting thing than loyalty to tradition, no thoughtful Christian could have taken exception to his utterance. But what Dr. Temple has written will assuredly lead many to think that, for the clerical mind, heresy is more heinous than hypocrisy, and that therefore the laity cannot safely trust the clergy as teachers of moral and spiritual truth where that truth conflicts with tradition. May we cite in justification of this assertion the following sentence from the *Freethinker* quoted in the *Church Times* of February 24:

> 'The cowardice of silence and the knavery of misrepresentation go most harmoniously with the Christian faith.'

Dr. Barnes and his Critics.

Bishop Barnes in his recent broadcast talk, published in full in the *Listener* of February 9, exposed his episcopal head to the knobkerries of the *Church Times*, and they were not slow to take advantage of it. The Bishop appeared to them to make less in the way of Christian professions than a bishop ought to make. They derided his 'blundering search for Truth' and lamented his lack of Christian conviction. They discovered notable omissions in his discourse, *e.g.* he had not even mentioned Christ.

There are others, however, less ecclesiastically minded, who will find it refreshing to read a popular episcopal utterance which is as free from religious cant as it is from sentimental rhetoric. The best sermon we ever heard on the Atonement never mentioned the term Atonement, and it is quite possible to profess the Christian faith without using the name of Christ. The Bishop has stepped down in his talk from the dogmatic platform — if he ever occupied it — and takes his stand beside the ordinary man who is not sure whether he himself is a Christian, or whether he understands what the Christian religion really is, but is very glad to listen to a Bishop who speaks about religion in a sincere and understandable way; who does not assume all sorts of beliefs at the outset and begins where the plain man begins and thinks in the way he thinks.

Dr. Barnes distinguishes clearly between the things he believes and hopes and the things he knows. He is convinced that if knowledge of God can be secured by man it must be secured in two ways: (1) by the study of Nature, who in response to such studies discloses her Maker and Master; (2) by the pursuit and practice of virtue. 'The Creator's light shines on those who see goodness clearly and follow it bravely.' Dr. Barnes asks: 'Shall we ever be able to see our destiny clearly?' He is not certain that we shall, but is convinced that we ought to try to do so.

> 'If the God whom we reverence exists, there are but two ways in which we can know Him. We can develop to the full all that is best within us and so strengthen the intuitions on which faith in God's goodness rests; or we can discover God's nature from the Universe which He has made. You may ask: Will the two ways lead to ultimate harmony? I think so. I believe that by them man's spiritual insight will gradually become clearer. Man, in fact, can hope to grow greatly in understanding as he seeks goodness in alliance with truth. It is goodness that redeems from insignificance the short life of such an organism as man, infinitely tiny in comparison with the size of the universe. It is man's growing success in the search for truth that links him to the things that are eternal. We are sore beset by ignorance and evil. None the less we need not be as men without hope. The future of humanity shall be better than its past. Doubtless dissatisfaction will always remain. The Golden Age will ever recede. Was not Stevenson right when he said that "to travel hopefully is a better thing than to arrive"?'

As for the future life, the Bishop affirms his hope of immortality, but not his certainty of it. This has led his critics to demand that as a Christian bishop he ought to affirm his certainty. But surely here the Bishop has the support of dogmatic precedent. The Nicene Creed teaches us to say, not that we believe in, but we 'look for' the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.

Crockford on Episcopal Pretensions.

Crockford's Clerical Directory,[2] variously known as *The Book of Martyrs* or *The Lives of the Saints*, makes its welcome appearance for 1939. The volume comprises over two thousand closely printed pages (in double columns) of accurate ecclesiastical information and is absolutely indispensable for all church officials. As usual, its Preface abounds in good sense, combined with caustic comment. The Editor is justly incensed by ex-

[2] Published by the Oxford University Press. 42*s*. net (63*s*. India paper). 1939.

amples of episcopal pretentiousness — rare, we hope, but none the less irritating and detrimental.

> 'Since the beginning of the present century there has been a rapid increase in the episcopate. Concurrently we have noticed a tendency to magnify the episcopal office in new and unfamiliar ways. Conspicuous amongst these is the bold assertion that the parochial clergy are no more than the delegates of the Bishop. We should not have thought this worth mentioning had not the following statement happened to meet our eye:
>
> > The Bishop is the centre of unity and the diocese is his charge, and that charge is divided up for practical pastoral purposes into parishes *in which a vicar shepherds a portion vicariously for the Bishop*. (Italics ours.)
>
> How do rectors and perpetual curates fit into this picture?
>
> It is not easy to see how this conception of the clergy can be reconciled with the language of the Ordinal — unless indeed the phrase *Messengers, Stewards, and Watchmen of the Lord* is to be amplified by the addition of the word *Bishop*—or with the existence and rights of the Lower Houses of Convocation. As this nonsense (we can call it nothing else) has appeared in print in a diocesan publication over the signature of the Bishop, it appears to have become necessary to state plainly certain facts which we had supposed were matters of common knowledge.
>
> 1. The Vicar is the deputy of the Rector. The Rector, as the owner of the parochial tithe, was responsible for the spiritual charge of the parish. When he was unable to act personally because he was an absentee, or a layman, or a corporation, he appointed a substitute to whom a portion of the tithe was assigned for his maintenance. . . .
>
> 2. The proper title of the parish priest is *Curate* (*i.e.* the man who has the cure of souls), as in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Compare *M. le Curé* in France. A semi-coloquial alternative is *Parson*, which is derived from *Persona* (*Ecclesiae*). The Representative of the Church is not the same as the Delegate of the Bishop' (pp. v, vi).

We, in the English Church, regard the bishops as constituting a separate order from the priesthood. In the Latin Church (and so in our English Church down to the Reformation) the bishop is classed not as a separate order but as a member of the priesthood, the first among equals (*primus inter pares*), as St. Jerome vigorously maintained. We regard a constitutional Episcopate as an excellent instrument of Church government, and are convinced that the only thing which will lead to its abolition is a tyrannical use of its powers. The 'prelacy' of the bishops in the Laudian period created 'the Root and Branch Policy' and led to the suppression of the English Episcopate, which, had Oliver Cromwell lived another ten years, would have become extinct. As it is most desirable in the cause of Church Reunion that the 'historic Episcopate' should be extended

among Christian communions which at present do not possess it, it is extremely important that our bishops should commend themselves, not only as judicious and open-minded administrators possessed of gifts of initiative and energy, but also that they should shew themselves to be holy and humble men of God.

Our Anglo-Catholic Underworld.

If English Protestantism has its underworld (we owe this description to Dr. Henson), Anglo-Catholicism also has its underworld. The mark of the Protestant underworld is the identification of the Christian religion with Biblical fundamentalism; the mark of the Anglo-Catholic underworld is that it identifies the Christian religion with Continental Romanism.

Many people will be grateful to Dr. Headlam for his published request to his clergy not to use the word Mass when referring to the service of Holy Communion. It is true that the word Mass does occur in the *First Prayer Book of King Edward VI* (1549): 'The Supper of the Lorde and the Holy Communion commonly called the Masse.' Here it is used to explain the New Testament titles of the Sacrament which had become strange, even unintelligible, to English ears. The Bishop of Gloucester gives the following reasons for his request:

> 'It is true that the word in itself has no particular meaning; but in the minds of most people it is associated with abuses that prevailed in the Middle Ages concerning the Communion Service and, in consequence, it is a term which accentuates the division between parties in the Church. Therefore, as we wish to draw people together as much as possible, it is a term to be avoided. We can speak of the Liturgy, or Eucharist, or Holy Communion, or the Lord's Supper — all good terms—and I think we had better avoid a word which, as I have said, accentuates differences.'

It is only a servile following of Romanist ways which has led to the re-introduction of the word Mass into the language of the English Church to-day. This servile imitation, not of the better but of the worse things which Rome has to offer, is a depressing feature of the underworld of Anglo-Catholicism, and we fear that it is on the increase in those circles. Our clerical tailors are quick to discern what will appeal to their clients, and we observe in one of the latest issued of their catalogues the following attractive items: 'Roman style cloaks,' 'cloaks lined Italian cloth,' 'Latin cassocks.'

The liturgical movement in the Roman Church is steadily

doing its best to purge, simplify and dignify the dress and ceremonial of those officiating in her services. Mgr. Duchesne is reported to have said to a Romanizing Anglo-Catholic, 'Ah! I see you wish to introduce into your Church all that we wish to exclude from ours.' As the process of Romanizing proceeds, our English Church will become the last refuge of those things which Roman liturgical reformers are resolved to banish. Oh shades of Percy Dearmer!

The writer of the Church of England letter to the American *Chronicle* (February, 1939), dealing with the need for 'new methods of approach, new ways of teaching, and, above all, for a new understanding of the intellectual and other problems of the non-churchgoer,' adds:

> 'This need is not likely to be met by the more extreme form of Anglo-Catholicism, the intellectual bases of which (apart from Rome) are radically unsound; for in churches of that type, whatever the intentions and the devotions may be, the impression is inevitably that the main emphasis falls upon things which do not occupy a large if any place in the teaching of Jesus.'

In this connection it may be noted that, notwithstanding all the stress laid upon sacramentalism in our English Church life today, the statistics of the *Official Year-Book of the Church of England* indicate a decline in the number of communicants.

> 'The figures for 1934 to 1937 are these: 2,319,093, 2,299,573, 2,241,825 and 2,225,880; that is, a shrinkage of 93,213 in four years.'

The same writer in commenting on the recent unhappy incident connected with the 'blessing of the crib' in Canterbury Cathedral, while professing complete indifference to cribs, and extreme dubiousness as to the significance of episcopal blessing in this and similar cases, remarks:

> 'The whole incident is unimportant except that it is one of many which receive publicity and give the impression that church-people, alike by their positive actions and by their protests, are really interested in the very trivial. If the world were convinced that the Church was on fire with energy for the great master truths of the Gospel and their application to all the activities of life, such trivialities as whether or no we are to have cribs in churches at Christmas would take their entirely subordinate place without notice or fuss, whether they were approved or not.'

It is probable that 'petty pieties' do far more to discredit the Christian religion than they do good to those who practise them, but religion is the slowest of all the great cultural activities to learn the truth of the classical dictum, 'nothing in excess.'

Modernists and the Creeds.

The following statement on the Creeds has been put forth by the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union:

> Since the period of the formulation of the Christian Creeds scientific research has given the world a completely new picture of the universe and of man's place and history in it, and has obliged us to read the Bible with a fresh and clearer understanding of its nature and inspiration. We therefore with full loyalty, as we believe, to the great religious tradition which we inherit in our common Christian faith, place on record our convictions:
>
> (1) That the Creeds, while expressing the historic and abiding faith of Christendom, include some beliefs which no longer commend that faith.
>
> (2) That the literal acceptance of certain clauses of the Creeds is impossible for many simple as well as educated Christians, though they would wish to affirm the religious ideas underlying the beliefs expressed in them.
>
> (3) That modern knowledge imposes upon all, clergy and laity alike, the need of re-interpreting the Creeds, and that this need is made the more urgent by their constant repetition in public worship as well as by the affirmation of them at Baptism and Ordination.
>
> (4) That the conscience of many Christianly-minded people is affronted by the recitation of beliefs which they do not hold, that this is one of the causes of the present alienation of men and women from the Church, and that some form of relief should be provided.
>
> (5) That a declaration of faith in Jesus Christ as Incarnate Word of God and of desire to be received into the Church should be accepted as sufficient qualification for Baptism.

Although our Bishops, by refusing to repudiate the Doctrinal Report, have done not a little to maintain the doctrinal comprehensiveness of the Church of England, yet more remains to be done, and to be done as quickly as possible. So far, what has been done by the Bishops justifies the right of the clergy to interpret the Creeds in the light of their studies, even though that interpretation may differ widely from Church tradition; but it has not done anything to help the more thoughtful and liberally-minded laity. Where the shoe pinches in the case of the laity is in the recitation of the Creeds in the Church Services. Although the clergy of studious type are, in a number of cases, satisfied with the right to re-interpret the Creeds, the liberally-minded laity desire, either that the old Creeds shall cease to be recited at the Church Services, or, if that be impossible in some churches, then that simple, modern creeds or affirmations of Christian faith and experience shall be permitted to take their

place where the representatives of the congregation so desire. It is very hard to see why our authorities should not arrange for this. Obviously in catechizing the young, and in preparing them for Confirmation, it would be a great advantage to be able to make use of some simple formula of Christian Faith and Duty which omitted all the archaisms and controversial issues from our present Creeds. A number of our more rigid traditionalists would undoubtedly oppose the granting of this needful and helpful concession, but in times of crisis the needs of the situation must determine the policy.

The Bishop of Ely in the *Ely Diocesan Gazette* for this month writes of the controversial articles in the Creeds thus :

> 'Nor should it be supposed that these historical clauses of the Creed are unimportant. If our Lord's body saw corruption in the grave, then the Church has no right to proclaim His Resurrection on the third day; and, as St. Paul said, "If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain." Again, I have grave doubts whether belief in the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation would long survive the abandonment of belief in the Virgin Birth of our Lord. Christianity is an historical religion; it is based on events in history, and if these events did not occur, the whole foundation of Christianity is imperilled. This is why I feel the seriousness of the present situation. Obviously the Church cannot be perpetually assuring the world that she believes her historic faith; but, in view of open denials of clauses of the Creed by some members of the clergy, the Lower House of Convocation, and thousands of their brethren, felt justified in asking the Bishops for reassurance; and it is the flat refusal to accede to a request so reasonable which has such grave significance. Just two years ago I said that I could foresee that my own loyalty to the Province to which the Diocese of Ely belongs might be strained almost to breaking point. It was no idle forecast.'

Dr. Heywood's ultimatum makes it clear that it is more than a negative policy which is demanded by the present situation. It seems to us that the best way for the Bishops to justify what the Bishop of Ely calls their 'flat refusal' is to follow it up with the promulgation of simple declarations of Christian Faith and Duty commended and authorized for alternative use in the daily Services, the Baptismal Service, and in the catechizing of the young.

Bible Reading and Modern Criticism.

A most detrimental conflict has arisen in connection with recent papers issued by the Bible Reading Fellowship. The first stone was cast in the form of the following letter to the

Church Times of February 3, signed by the Vicar, curates and churchwardens of Fulham Parish Church:

> 'Sir, — Some years ago, when the Bible Reading Fellowship was formed, it fulfilled a crying need, and Catholic and Evangelical alike welcomed it thankfully, and commended it enthusiastically to their flocks. But some doubted.
>
> The doubters are being justified. For example: in this month's paper, on the first of the month we are given an interpretation of the term, "the Word of God," which is dangerously near pantheism; on the ninth we art told that we may choose between two interpretations of the water being made wine at Cana, either that it actually happened or that it was a "spiritual experience." Recently, the children were told that what Moses saw was not a bush that was burning, but the sunlight on the leaves; and some time ago the Ever-Virginity of our Lady was denied.
>
> In view of this tendency, and in answer to the distressed inquiries, both of instructed Catholics and of old-fashioned Evangelicals, we have had to tell our congregation that we can no longer recommend them to use the Fellowship paper. It is becoming the vehicle of an outmoded and unorthodox criticism rather than of devotion.'

Other letters followed supporting the charges of the Fulham officials, with whom the *Church Times* had already sided.

To these charges Canon Vernon Storr replied in the *Church Times* of February 10 as follows:

> 'Sir,—Will you allow me to reply to the letter and editorial comment in your last week's issue, on the Bible Reading Fellowship Notes on St. John's Gospel?
>
> I am frankly puzzled by the criticisms offered, which seem to me to take little account of the teaching of the notes considered as a whole. I deal with the three main criticisms.
>
> (*a*) Objection is taken to the statement that "Creation is God's uttered Word," and "is alive," and "He still lives in it." Surely the created universe is the utterance of God. So great a theologian as the late Dr. Hort spoke in his Hulsean Lectures (page 144) of the Word of God "as the eternal, fundamental utterance of Him whose diffracted and remoter utterance is the universe." God utters, or expresses Himself, in creation in an ascending scale, which culminates in His perfect utterance in Christ. There is no hint of pantheism, as the letter suggests, in teaching which makes it abundantly clear that for its origin and continuance the universe is dependent on the creative will of Him in whom we and all things "live and move and have our being." This is an assertion of divine transcendence. The editorial comment suggests that the teaching on the Incarnation is "somewhat one-sided and inadequate." But on page 3 of the notes it is stated that Christ is "the Word made flesh — the perfect expression in flesh and blood both of what God eternally is, and what man in God's purpose was meant to become." Is not this an adequate statement?
>
> (*b*) With regard to the miracle at Cana, the notes, in my opinion, rightly try to meet the needs of those who accept the story literally and of that large class of people who find difficulty over the miraculous element. The notes take no side in the dispute. But I feel that here

and throughout they have the immense value of directing the reader's attention to the fact that the writer of this Gospel is always trying to pass below the surface of things to their eternal significance. The notes, despite their inevitable brevity, do seem to me to emphasize those fundamental spiritual truths and values of Christianity, which it was St. John's deliberate purpose to elucidate, at a time when Christianity was in some danger of losing its essential character.

(*c*) The criticism on the notes dealing with the story of the Woman of Samaria overlooks the fact that the sentence, "A real historical incident . . . is allegorized and dramatized," is a quotation from C. J. Wright's *The Mission and Message of Jesus,* to which the writer of the notes expresses his indebtedness. The editorial comment is, "Does the Bible Reading Fellowship really pretend to any such precise and private information?" No, of course it does not; but the notes rightly call attention to the fact that in reading the Gospel we must keep in mind the tendency of the evangelist to dramatize and allegorize, which is surely a commonplace of interpretation of the Gospel. In the commentary on St. John's Gospel in the "Moffatt New Testament Commentary" Series, there is an illuminating section, "History or Didactic Drama?" in which occurs the following passage: "It is not the least of our evangelist's merits that he appreciates the peril of tethering Christian faith and doctrine and practice too closely to the exact details of particular events in the earthly life of Jesus. On any estimation the religious value of this Gospel must always be greater than the historical." But the notes are careful to point out how criticism has swung back to a truer appreciation of the historicity of the Gospel. Anyone who will read such commentaries as those of Scott, Strachan, Drummond, Macgregor, and many others, with an open mind, will be forced to admit that this Gospel is less a strict history (though based on historical facts) than an interpretation by one who had pondered long on the problem of Christ's person, and had lived out what he taught.

VERNON F. STORR,
Member of the B.R.F. Council,
Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster.'

How the vexed questions concerning the Fourth Gospel are answered matters little compared with the larger issue whether competent and reverently-minded teachers of the New Testament are to be allowed freedom to answer these questions as they think they ought to answer them, or whether they are to be compelled to answer them in accordance with Church tradition. St. Paul wrote: 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' And Tertullian wrote in an oft-cited phrase: 'Christ called Himself the Truth; He did not call Himself Tradition.' It would be a calamity if so really useful an institution as 'The Bible Reading Fellowship' should be split and weakened because a reasonable and reverent freedom was not permitted to those whose difficult task it is to present the ancient Scriptures to simple readers in the light of modern views.

REINSTATING THE INDIVIDUAL

By J. C. Hardwick, author of *No Casual Creed*, etc.

AT the present time our liberals, democrats, idealists and intellectuals are filled with growing dismay at the rise of what is known as Totalitarianism. They are dismayed with good reason, for the new ideology spells disaster for all of them. They must reconcile themselves either to extinction, or to taking the offensive.

Unfortunately liberals, idealists and intellectuals are not good at taking the offensive. They feel that it should suffice to demonstrate that a cause is reasonable, and that this ought to ensure its success. Having been intellectually refuted the Totalitarians ought to oblige by fading away, leaving the world bathed in a sweet reasonableness. Unfortunately, this does not happen. You may refute to your own satisfaction the theories of the National Socialist, but his policy will not be diverted by a single inch; he proceeds according to plan.

What the liberal intellectual fails to see is that beliefs, however noble and true, do not prevail of themselves, but because of the men who hold them. The dangerous prevalence of totalitarian beliefs proves this. These beliefs are not formidable because of their rationality (which is defective), but because of the will-to-victory of those who hold them, for the average Marxist or National Socialist is no half-believer.

It may be said that liberal intellectuals have no intention of becoming fervent and mystical believers in any ideology which they cannot base on a good rational foundation. They cannot agree to judge of beliefs by the fanaticism with which they are held. But there is no reason why they should. The point to notice is that if liberals want their ideas to prevail, they must hold them strongly, and with a will-to-victory not less than that with which the Totalitarians hold theirs. And if the liberal intellectual cannot hold strongly any belief which lacks a sufficient foundation in fact and reason, it follows that such a foundation must be provided.

Thus our liberal intellectuals and idealists, if their offensive is to succeed, must be in possession of clear and convincing reasons for the faith that is in them; and this at present is just what many of them are sadly short of. They seem, in fact, to have lost their grip; they can offer no convincing philosophy of liberalism—only a few stale *clichés* about democracy, liberty, equality, fraternity, the rights of the individual, and so on. The Totalitarian regards it as mush.

And the truth is that it *is* all a little out of date. A lot of it goes back to Rousseau, and, although the author of *The Social Contract* was a genius, he lived a good while ago, and much water has flowed under the arches since his day. Take his immortal slogan, 'Man was born free, but everywhere he is in chains.' That man was ever 'free,' in the liberal sense of being a free, independent, isolated individual, is an anthropological myth. And institutions may be bad, but it is men who create them. If you liquidate the priest, the minister for propaganda steps into his shoes; and on the king's exit there enters the Commissar, or the Chief of the Secret Police. It is certainly a mistake to take the 'noble savage' (as Rousseau appears to have done) as the type of freedom. The member of a primitive tribe is the least free, and the most conservative and conventional, of mankind. Compared with him the mid-Victorian *bourgeois* is a revolutionary. Moreover, his very ignorance limits the primitive's freedom because it limits his powers.

And if the science of anthropology discredits this aspect of Rousseau's ideology, the science of biology is similarly destructive of another aspect. The science of genetics affords little evidence that men are born equal or deserve equally to succeed. And now to give the *coup de grâce* to liberal doctrine comes the psychologist, who derides the notion that man is a rational animal—a notion, by the way, which was *not* entertained by the best minds of the eighteenth century, *e.g.* by Swift, Hume, and Gibbon.

While the liberal ideology has thus been undermined, its exponents have been guilty of a certain complacency. Optimism has been a part of their creed, and they have blandly put a blind eye to the telescope. At least they have done so until quite lately, for of recent years the liberal idealists and intellectuals

would appear to have lost faith, if not in their peculiar doctrines, then in their power to convince an erring world of their truth.

In short, the liberals, like Bunyan's hero, seeing that things are in a sad mess, are disposed to quit the City of Destruction. Their line is to shake the dust off their feet and to cut loose in favour of a policy of personal isolationism. They hasten to dissociate themselves from the errors and crimes of their fellow-men, and to mark the cleavage, aim at contracting out of society as the best means of obtaining a sound liberal individualism.

But it would be ungracious to dwell at further length upon the retreat of our intellectuals; rather should some tonic be sought for which might convert their defeatism into a determined will-to-victory.

The primary need, if Liberalism is to revive as a living and vigorous creed, is *a new philosophy of the individual*. And to be effective, this new philosophy must be such as can be grasped by the ordinary man, and arouse his enthusiasm. It is not a creed for the high-brows alone that is needed; for the battle will not be fought on that level. The struggle will not be one of academic discussion.

The writer of this article is by no means qualified to supply the new philosophy of the individual which is essential if liberalism is to revive; but he will nevertheless make bold to offer a few hints to those who would essay the bold task of putting idealist liberals back upon the rails.

(1) The new philosophy of the individual must not be merely individualist. It must accept the impossibility of contracting out of society — even if that were desirable, which it is not. The individual owes everything about him — his character, his thoughts, ideals, mentality, as well as his clothes and bread and butter—to the society of which he is an organic part. He cannot contract out of his responsibilities to society; the individual cannot live his life on the principle of limited liability. 'To abstain from social relationships is to abstain from life.' The only way to contract out which is not a muddle-headed and hypocritical sham, is to give away one's shirt and creep into a corner to die. An isolationist ultra-individualist who did this would be a brave man, though he would not do much good to the world,

save to bestow upon it an example of clear thinking (no negligible benefit, by the way).

(2) This will lead on to a new and less individualistic conception of personal freedom. A man is not free in spite of, but because of his social relationships. These increase his powers and his opportunities, and so increase his freedom. A savage in the jungle, or Crusoe on his island, is not free, being ringed around by obstacles to action. Civilized society by its control of Nature gives freedom to its members such as no savage has experience of. 'Society is the only instrument of freedom.'[1] It may be added that the individual in society is free in proportion as that society is just. Since this point leads off into economics and politics, we need not pursue it here; but it is a point to be remembered and developed.

(3) It should be remembered that for the natural sciences the individual has not only no status, but no existence. Science cannot recognize the unique individual, but only the interchangeable unit. Scientific method cuts through the jungle of concrete fact by abstracting all individual differences. In the sphere of physics, such differences are so infinitesimal as to be negligible; but in the sphere of biology they increase as you climb the biological ladder, and when the sphere of psychology is reached, which is concerned with mind-endowed beings, individuality becomes not only important but crucial. This is a point to be emphasized because the scientific habit of regarding the individual as a unit has given Totalitarianism its excuse to reduce citizens of a State to precisely that status; the status of a replaceable cog in a machine. Employed citizens are bits of a functioning machine, and the unemployed are a collection of spare parts. None have any real existence as individuals, and none of the personal rights belonging to individuals are theirs. They are labour or man-power units actually and not metaphorically. The truth is that Totalitarianism as a functioning system is a direct product of scientific method on the one hand, and of applied science on the other. It is modern Industrialism's

[1] See the admirable essay on Liberty in Christopher Caudwell's *Studies in a Dying Culture* (John Lane, 1938)—a most stimulating book, and a remorseless exposure of 'orthodox' liberalism and contemporary 'escapist' individualism.

twin, and is as much the product of Science as the Reformation was of the Revival of Learning. Totalitarianism is no chance product; if it were, it would be less formidable.

(4) The next point would be the more or less metaphysical one that reality is most clearly seen in the individual, and not (as Plato and modern science both aver) in the generalized type or 'idea.'[2] For this reason Art supplies a far fuller revelation of reality than Science, for Art concentrates on the individual thing or person. The reason why Shaw's plays are not Art like Shakespeare's is that while the latter dealt with persons the former deals with types. Shaw is another modern Plato, who began as a Socialist and now ends as a Fascist. Cleverness does not suffice to create a work of art. Science, which deals only with abstractions from reality, must always remain at one remove from reality; its world is the shadow world of Plato's cave (as Plato's world was too, had he known it). Art, on the other hand, *touches* reality, or rather, gets beneath its skin. A philosophy of Art and a philosophy of the individual must go hand in hand; in fact the two are one.[3]

(5) The truth that reality is seen in the individual is of course a truth for Religion, as well as a truth for Art. Religion deals with the individual, which is why Fascism and Communism are not genuine religions, even though they may be believed in with a fervour of real religious intensity. That reality is revealed in the individual is expressed in religious language by the affirmation that man is 'A child of God.' Religion lays it down that the individual human being can be in conscious contact with the Source of reality, which is personal as he is—or if not personal, then something more than, and not less than, personal. The non-personal Absolute of the Idealists is indistinguishable from the God-knows-what of the Materialists. The two are only

[2] The standpoints of Plato and modern science are identical. Both regard the general as more real than the particular. It is no mere chance coincidence that Plato was the first Fascist as well as the first Communist; or that Hegel, the modern Plato, gave Hitler his theory of the State, and Marx his Dialectic.

[3] W. McNeile Dixon's recent Gifford Lectures, *The Human Situation*, are an important contribution to the philosophy of the individual which so sorely needs working out.

complementary sides of one coin — which is of bad metal anyway. Thus Religion, like Art, is the negation of Totalitarianism. True, Totalitarianism can produce a kind of art, as it can produce a kind of religion. But it is not without significance that for the National Socialist *quantitative* and not qualitative standards apply in the aesthetic sphere (where of course they are wholly incongruous). Hitler insists on State buildings being *big*.[4] Here he resembles Constantine, another totalitarian who lived in a period of cultural decay. Constantine had to plunder Trajan's Arch for sculptures for his own vulgar Arc de Triomph.

(6) Exponents of the new philosophy of the individual must not be afraid of being empirical; their theories must not be entirely *a priori* but based upon facts, those which are comparatively rare, as well as those which are commonplace. Since the rise of the physical sciences there has been a tendency to overlook certain facts about human personality which are of the highest importance because they are highly embarrassing to the theoretical framework constructed by those sciences and imposed by them upon the whole of reality, like some bed of Procrustes. Enough evidence of an incontrovertible character has now been accumulated to prove that human beings are endowed with other senses than the five physical ones; though they may be undeveloped, or atrophied. Three such senses for the existence of which good evidence exists, are telepathy, clairvoyance, and precognition; and their existence shatters the space-time scheme built up on the basis of material supplied by the physical senses.[5]

[4] ' It is difficult to obtain material for building a small house in Germany to-day, but during the last twelve months 6,000 workmen have been employed day and night in building the new Imperial Chancellary (the cost is reputed to be 300,000,000 marks). Costly marbles and various kinds of exotic woods are being used for this palace of unexampled luxury. It has an air-raid shelter that for depth and extensiveness must be unequalled throughout the world . . . Although Hitler's tastes with regard to food and drink are simple, he lives in vast architectural and artistic luxury. Masterpieces stolen from famous German and former Austrian picture galleries adorn the rooms of the highest among the Nazi leaders.'—' Manchester Guardian,' March 4th, 1939.

[5] An admirable selection of the evidence for the existence and functioning of these non-physical senses will be found in G. N. M. Tyrrell's *Science and Psychical Phenomena* (1938).

(7) A philosophy of the individual must also include a reasoned exposition of what is meant by freedom of the will, and a refutation of 'behaviourist' theories of human action in terms purely of physical stimulus and reaction. It is not always realized that if our consciousness of free choice is not a delusion, the mechanistic scheme of the physical sciences is shattered no less definitely than it is by the phenomena of telepathy and precognition, which make the accepted physical concepts of space and time untenable.

(8) A philosophy of the individual cannot ignore the problem of immortality and the survival of physical death. A new theory of the body in terms of spirit rather than of matter may be envisaged.

(9) It is important also to emphasize the fact that the individual is the growing-point of the community in every cultural sphere — in art, religion, science. Where the individual is suppressed, cultural progress ceases (as we can see already in totalitarian States), and where progress ceases degeneration immediately sets in. Cultural capital cannot simply be preserved; you have to add to it continually or it evaporates. A culture is like an organism; it must be fed or it dies. A tendency to suppress or discourage the individual is more widespread in the modern world than it has been for three centuries and is not by any means confined to totalitarian countries. The progressive standardization of humanity, a product of industrialism and applied science, threatens culture with a creeping paralysis. This is the price we pay for our modern suppression of the individual.

(10) Finally the new philosophy of the individual must have its practical applications, which indeed are of primary importance. Apart from them the new philosophy will remain in the region of aerobatics. Just as physical and chemical science has transformed the surface of life by being applied, so the psychological science which may be confidently expected to grow up under the aegis of the new philosophy will have its techniques which will bestow new powers as well as new experiences upon human beings. And just as physics has affected our view of the universe by impoverishing it, so the psychology of the future

will affect our view of the universe by enriching it. Our science of the outer world will be supplemented by a science of the inner world, which is quite as vast, and presents not less fruitful spheres for exploration.

And now to return to Totalitarianism. As the writer envisages this twentieth-century ideology, it is a product of nineteenth century science, which banished spirit and the individual from the sphere of reality. It is useless for liberals with an effete philosophy dating from the eighteenth century to utter wails of despair and hymns of hate; and it is not only useless but cowardly for them to slink off into some retreat where they imagine they can be *au dessous de la mêlée*. The battle to-day includes everybody, and those who seek to escape it will only be massacred. Let liberals realize that totalitarianism is a challenge. If this new ideology has more vitality than they have, it will exterminate them; and they will deserve no man's pity. Have the liberals the spirit for an offensive, or will they slip into the Limbo of Lost Causes?

SOME THOUGHTS ON MORAL REARMAMENT

By the Rev. Norman Darrall, Vicar of Trent Vale, Stoke-on-Trent.

SPEAKING at a recent conference on 'Modern Christian Education,' Dr. A. C. Bouquet revealed some startling figures. He said:

> 'To-day . . . in the County of London, out of 7,500,000 people, less than 400,000 have attachment to any place of worship; which means that nearly 95 per cent., though not by any means anti-religious or even anti-Christian in sentiment, are unattached.'

We can probably take these figures as typical of the country as a whole.

Now, whilst it is a matter for thankfulness that the ninety-five per cent. cannot truthfully be described as anti-religious or even anti-Christian, it has to be remembered that we are confronted to-day by many powerful influences that are decidedly anti-

Christian. In meeting and overcoming such influences, which are both subtle and highly organized, for all practical purposes we have to rely on five per cent. of the population. Dr. T. R. Glover, Public Orator at the University of Cambridge, has said that the early Christians defeated their pagan adversaries because they out-thought them, out-lived them and out-died them. The question is, can the five per cent. to-day do this?

Let us consider this question. The five per cent. represents the number of people attached to some place of worship, to some form of organized religion, and it is necessary that such folk should display the qualities of superior thinking and of superior living. It is easy to see how drastically this reduces the percentage of effective Christians. We know, unfortunately, only too well, that the majority of us who 'come to church' simply are not distinguished by the quality of our thinking and living. Therefore, in attempting quite honestly to see what is the situation facing us in these days, we find ourselves led on from Dr. Bouquet's figures to others—which each reader must supply for himself—far more alarming. Take away from the five per cent. all those whose thinking and living is poor and indifferent in quality—no better than the average—and what figure per cent. have we left?

It would appear, therefore, that we are in a somewhat bleak and unpromising situation. Is it a hopeless situation? We would say not, but it must be met. It has been met before, along the lines of 'out-thinking' and 'out-living,' and, in the last resort, the majority always follow the minority. We must not, in face of the situation, be defeatist; neither, on the other hand, can we regard it with easy-going placidity.

What has caused ninety-five per cent. of our population to be outside the Christian Churches as far as active membership is concerned? There have, of course, been many influences at work, but two in particular, we would say. First, poverty of thought, and, secondly, poverty of life on the part of the Church, *i.e.* on the part of members of the Church. Largely as a result of this twofold failure, both ministerial and lay, large tracts of life in our country have become semi-pagan, and a high percentage of our population has lapsed from church membership. We have been weak where the early Christians were strong.

If one were asked which was the more responsible for our situation, poor thinking or indifferent living, the answer would not be easy to give. No one, we are certain, would wish to belittle the importance of good and fine living as a vital part of our Christian witness. We would agree with this, whilst adding the reminder that such living must, if it is to be true and effective, face and permeate life as a whole, and not simply a part of it. For example, whilst we have no sympathy with the desire (which is *said* to exist) to bring politics into religion, we would affirm emphatically that religion must be brought into politics and that the doing of this and the like constitutes a part of our Christian witness.

But, whilst most people would admit the necessity for the good life as a vital factor in Christian witness (however inadequate their thoughts of it may be), there is a widespread failure to understand the need for good and true thinking. Few of the five per cent. could be truthfully described as intelligent Christians; few of them devote thought and mental effort to the consideration of their religious faith; few can be said to 'outthink' the men and women who profess no definite Christian allegiance. Yet in these days, when the educational standard is higher than ever before in our country, it is more than usually necessary that those who profess religious beliefs should be able to justify them at the bar of reason and that the beliefs themselves should be intellectually justifiable. Again, as the Bishop of Birmingham has said,

> 'Without the severe discipline of reason the decline of faith through luxuriant emotion to superstition is certain.'

Further, there is a widespread suspicion on the part of many people that the progress of scientific thought and criticism has cast doubts upon the validity of the Christian faith. It is largely on account of this suspicion, which has affected people of different types and has done so in varying degrees, that the shrinkage of church membership has become so acute. This situation has not been adequately met. A great many of the clergy and practically all of the laity have closed their eyes—or heads—to it. It is not that it cannot be met, but that, by our poverty of thought, we have refused to meet it.

A readiness to think and think hard must, then, be an integral part of that Moral Rearmament for which a call is just now being made. Otherwise, the 'rearmament' will be incomplete and, to that extent, ineffective. As our thinking, as well as our living, thus takes on a richer and bolder tone, history, as we saw it through the eyes of Dr. Glover, will repeat itself. 'Sire,' said Theodore Beza to the King of Navarre,

> 'it belongs in truth to the Church of God, in the name of which I speak, to receive blows and to give them, but it will please your Majesty to take notice that it is an anvil that has worn out many hammers.'

The Christian Faith, when it is adequately presented, understood and lived, has in it still complete satisfaction for the whole man—body, mind and spirit.

> 'God is as truly the God of Nature as the God of Grace; of that which bravely questioneth and that which humbly kneels.'

But it must *be* adequately presented, understood and lived.

We may well conclude with words written as long ago as 1871 in a great book which seems to us as applicable to the needs and circumstances of our own day as it was to those of the generation in which it was written:

> 'The possession of truth is one of the distinctive marks of the new covenant; and so the full and careful use of truth is the distinctive agency by which a ripe wisdom and therefore an effective righteousnes is made attainable for Christians. It was no new thing to desire and pursue and find truth. It was no new thing to aim at the service of God as the highest end of action. But it was an altogether new thing to learn that the knowledge of truth is indispensable for the mature service of God, and that the desire and pursuit of truth is an essential part of a holy worship. . . . Hitherto the Church has been mainly fending for itself on the truth which it possessed. Now it must learn to go forth beyond its own borders and put its truth to fresh uses. As the Apostles went forth to reduce all the nations without to discipleship, so now it is ours to carry that light which alone is the light of life into all the outlying worlds of knowledge as of action and of life.'[1]

[1] F. J. A. Hort: *The Way: the Truth: the Life*, pp. 43 and 88.

LIBERAL ANGLO-CATHOLICISM

By R. Gladstone Griffith, M.A., Editor of 'After 400 Years' Series, etc., Vice-Chairman of the Council of M.C.U.

READERS of the *Modern Churchman* will be interested in the recent issue of a manifesto by a number of Anglo-Catholics who are anxious to establish a group within their own ranks 'to give due expression to the Liberal Catholic tradition within the Church of England.' Modernists will feel genuine sympathy with the purpose thus put forward and can only trust that the signatories may be successful in their effort to show 'that the truth of the Gospel must be established not by appeals to the formularies of the "undivided Church," but by free discussion which accepts the principles of scientific criticism.' Evangelicals have for long had their Anglican Group Movement in which the need for taking new truth into account has been effectively maintained with profit to all who have been susceptible to its influence. But the priority of Evangelicalism as a group movement within the church will only serve to make Modernists the more ready to welcome the formation of a similar movement on the other wing.

It is, perhaps, pertinent to remark that Modernism has always stood for an attitude, and not for a party creed, for an orientation, not for a set formulation of doctrine, and has sought rather to promote study than to prescribe results. If there are some theological conclusions which are characteristic of Modernists, they are so only because impartial research into the evidence and free consideration of doctrine have led to uniformity of judgement. We trust the honesty of facts and the ability of human intelligence to interpret them under the guidance of God, so that His purposes may be more and more clearly disclosed to mankind. We oppose the agnosticism which sees daylight only in the past and impenetrable fog in the future, entrance into which is a policy of madness. It will not be a waste of time to distinguish once again between specific posi-

tions held, it may be, only tentatively by recognized leaders of Modernism and the principles which inspire it. If tradition has much to tell us that is of value, since the past has proved its worth, yet the trend of thought to-day points forward by evolutionary methods, and what has served one period must be adjusted, and, in some cases, be replaced for effective functioning in the future. The classical exposition of the doctrine of development is to be found in the Johannine Gospel and Epistles, where the near approach of the Second Coming is subordinated to the continuous guidance of the Holy Spirit in the hearts and minds of believers. Steady progress can be traced from the dim periods now revealed by archaeologists throughout religious history down to the present time.

In considering, therefore, the manifesto, we are more interested in its proclamation of general principles than in any precise statement of theological belief or declaration of practical policy in matters affecting conduct. The balance as between the tenets of Catholicism, the usages of the Prayer Book and the needs of the age in which we live, is surely right and just; for all are essential factors in the situation. Again, the catholic interpretation of Church of England doctrine maintained since the sixteenth century must be put forward in a way 'which meets the needs of the present time.' Forms of worship 'which are alien to our religious history' are not to be encouraged. Whilst the work of the Reformers in some ways obscured what was of value, drastic reform was needed, and Roman tradition is not the infallible guide to depart from which is an act of error. The guidance of the Holy Spirit leads to the development of doctrine and to modifications in the light of growing knowledge. With all this which is happily stated in the manifesto Modernists will agree.

Insistence upon the missionary aspect of the church's work, upon the great fundamental doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, upon the place of sacramental worship in the church, rejection of the idea that Roman or Thomist theology alone has a claim to be heard, the attempt to survey the questions connected with marriage rather than to dogmatize and much else throughout the whole document we must find to be in keeping

with the principles for which Modernism has stood, and with much of this we should be inclined to agree without qualification. The manifesto strikes the reader as being truly Anglo-Catholic; for it breathes the spirit of English reasonableness and gives proper weight to the tradition of past Christian experience, which is rightly called catholic, in distinction from that which is local, racial and limited.

Having said all this, with some degree of confidence that it is representative of Modernism to-day taken as a whole, we turn to the one matter in regard to which the manifesto seems to fail in its aim and to halt in its argument:

> 'Thus we believe that the Virgin Birth and the bodily Resurrection of our Lord are necessarily involved in the doctrine of the Incarnation. But here, as elsewhere in so far as the Christian faith is bound up with particular historical events, the recognition of the place of reason in the thought and teaching of the Church makes it necessary to strengthen the authoritative proclamation by a strictly historical criticism.'

First, how can the reliability of statements about historical events be based upon doctrinal necessity? Either the virgin birth and the bodily resurrection occurred in space and time or they did not. The question can only be solved by historical research and literary criticism. If the theologian steps in and influences the student in his researches he is guilty of interference. If the student and the theologian are one and the same person, and theological wish becomes father to historical thought, we should have to admit that the results are invalid; in fact, the answer will have been 'cooked'! Such a process is equally repugnant to the general purport of the manifesto and to Modernists.

Again, what is the force of the word 'strengthen' when used to suggest that criticism must be on the side of tradition in the proclamation of the Gospel? We may hope that it will side with us, but what if it does not do so? In the matter of the virgin birth, the verdict of scholarship from all quarters is steadily hardening against the validity of the historical evidence for it, if it is not truer to say that it has already ruled it out of the province of history. There can be but one attitude for all liberals to adopt, that is, for all those whose minds are not closed to reason. The historical question must be approached with an open mind

and in the determination to follow the evidence wherever it may lead. The signatories will, doubtless, admit that the clause to which reference has been made is inclined to beg the question.

Thirdly, it is a simple and incontestable fact that many who have been led to reject both the idea of virgin birth and the bodily resurrection have found that their grasp of the great doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation has been in no way shaken. On the contrary, they have discovered that these are much more naturally held and explained on the basis of a natural birth and of resurrection appearances such as St. Paul suggests in his classical exposition in *I Cor.* xv. Unless Modernists who have had this experience are to be dismissed as negligible, in spite of their growing numbers, they afford a very live challenge to the contention that the Incarnation is bound up with the virgin birth.

Space does not allow any summary, however brief, of the considerations which have led many to reject the idea that Christ was not born into the world in a normal way. But the arguments are familiar and the ground has been examined often and exhaustively. This is well illustrated by an experience of the present writer one summer evening in Hyde Park. A recognized and well-informed heckler invited him to state from the platform of the Christian Evidence Society whether he believed that a man had ever been born without a father. The crowd, swollen by curiosity, was given a negative answer, and the heckler immediately turned upon his heel for happier hunting near at hand. Both heckler and speaker knew the facts. In consequence the gospel was preached for more than an hour to a quiet and reverent crowd. Men are hungry for the gospel, but it must be preached in terms which satisfy their reason.

All that has been said only draws attention to the necessity of submitting the whole of the content of belief to examination in the light of reason. Liberalism is a jealous mistress who will not allow her servants to offer her a part in the hope that they may retain a peculiar treasure for themselves.

THE ENGLISH HOLY COMMUNION

By The Editor.

IT is said that Cranmer gave to the people of England the Holy Communion in place of the Mediaeval Mass. The statement is true, for it is to Cranmer that we owe our English Communion Service. But what a price he and his colleagues paid for it! He, the Primate of all England, was burnt alive at the stake, and four other English bishops and many minor personages.

The Mediaeval Mass was the primitive 'Breaking of Bread' or 'Lord's Supper' (these are the New Testament names for this rite) corrupted under the influence of primitive magic and religious materialism. Corrupted also, some would add, under the influence of priestly pretensions and ecclesiastical love of power.

When we study the New Testament accounts of the institution and practice of the rite—accounts, it is true, which are very fragmentary and not in complete agreement on all points, the earliest and fullest of them being that written by St. Paul to his Corinthian converts about twenty years after the Crucifixion—certain things stand out quite clearly (*I Cor.* x, xi).

(1) The first is that the Breaking of the Bread was a religious and social rite which partook of the nature of a commemoration. The word St. Paul uses is not *mnemosunon*, which may mean a memorial sacrifice, but *anamnesis*, a recollection, or recalling to memory, of a past event. The past event commemorated in this case was the tragic and heroic death of the Founder of the Christian religion. In recalling the death, the primitive Christians recalled also, not only how, but why, Jesus had died.

(2) The second outstanding feature of the Service is the ratification of a Covenant (*diatheke*, often translated testament). This Covenant Jesus spoke of as being made with His blood. All religious covenants in that ancient Semitic world were made with blood. This covenant Jesus named the 'New Covenant,' to distinguish it from the Old Covenant which God was believed to

have made with Israel through Moses. The 'New Covenant' was made by the Divine Father with all mankind through Jesus Christ.

This notion of a Covenant between God and man may seem a very curious one to modern minds, but it deserves the most profound attention. The religions of mankind differ much, although all have some truth in common. Many of these religions can be classed as Nature Religions. They express themselves in the deification and worship of natural objects — rocks, trees, animals, streams, celestial bodies.

Then there are other classes of religion which are essentially human. They deify consciously, and perhaps more often unconsciously, the community or social unit: it may be the tribe, the city, the state, the nation, the empire, in which men find, as they believe, their safety and their welfare — the fulfilment of their hopes and ideals — their largest self. This is deified, and usually the human head or heads of this community, be they priests or kings, become the object of divine rites.

These two classes of religions are essentially religions of the soil and blood, like the new paganism in Germany which delights to describe its religion in these terms.

But the religion of Covenant is of quite another order. It does not begin with the visible, the materialistic. It begins with the invisible — that invisible world, it may be of impenetrable darkness or of blinding light, which the natural sight of man cannot pierce. From this unseen world something comes forth—an influence, a voice, a vision. It makes its appeal to the individual. Primitive people regarded these visions and voices as objective: modern psychologists know them to have been subjective. But the point to be noted is the effect which they had on the individuals which experienced them. These individuals were called out of their normal surroundings into a new relationship. They thus became people of a peculiar class—the Called of God. Not seldom this Call of God was associated with something else — the consciousness of some great redemptive act of God. That act might be thought of as having taken place in some historic occurrence — something objective — such as the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage. In many cases, however, the redemptive act was subjective in character — the

deliverance of him who was called out from some condition of terror: mental or physical anguish, moral or spiritual blindness, an overwhelming sense of sin and guilt.

This Call was thus both a covenant call and a redemptive call. It called the individual into a covenant relation with the redeeming power. This covenant relation was based on conditions of loyalty and obedience which he who was called must observe if the covenant relation was to be maintained with his Deliverer. These conditions varied. They might be the observance of external rites and legal precepts, or obedience to the monitions of moral and spiritual inspiration.

It is because these covenant religions had their origin in the unseen world, and drew not only their origin, but also their life and strength from it, that they possess a vitality and vigour, a power of conviction and of courage, which enables them to triumph ultimately in conflict with all those lower religions—the religions of the blood and of the soil.

The religion of Israel and the religion of Christ are covenant religions. The former was known as the Old Covenant, the latter as the New Covenant. In the former, the terms of the Covenant consisted of a legal code inscribed on stone and parchment, interpreted and enforced by priests and kings. The terms of the New Covenant were written by the Divine Spirit on the moral consciousness of the covenant people. This spiritual Covenant was based on a growing knowledge of God—the product, not of external instruction, but of moral and spiritual inspiration. The prophet Jeremiah wrote in the sixth century B.C.:

> 'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel. . . . I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts. . . . And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord' (*Jeremiah* xxxi, 31 *ff.*).

It was this New Covenant which Jesus inaugurated at the Last Supper with the blood of His Passion. And it is this Covenant and its inauguration which we commemorate at the Holy Communion.

When we examine the mediaeval Mass for which Cranmer substituted the Holy Communion we cannot fail to recognize how greatly it has changed from the primitive Breaking of Bread

or Lord's Supper. This change, as we have noted, was brought about under the influence of primitive sub-Christian religion. Magic and materialism are the two dominant influences which have effected this transformation. There are, I believe I am correct in saying, three great moments in the 'action' of the mediaeval Mass:

(1) The first is Transubstantiation, when the utterance of the correct formula accompanied by the correct manual acts performed by a validly consecrated priest transmutes the substance of the bread and wine into substance of the Body and Blood of Christ.

(2) The second great moment in the 'action' of the Mass is when the priest offers to the Divine Father the consecrated elements as the expiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead.

(3) The third moment in the 'action' of the Mass is the adoration by celebrant and congregation of the sacramental elements in which it is believed our Lord Himself has deigned temporarily to dwell.

How widely this religious rite differs from that which was instituted by Jesus in the Upper Room on the night of his betrayal and that which St. Paul celebrated several decades later in the upper room at Troas! In that primitive rite there was no transmutation of the elements, no offering of them to God as a propitiatory sacrifice, no worship of them. These three things were deliberately omitted from the English Communion Service by Cranmer.

(1) The English Communion Service begins with the Christian Covenant. It is concerned with the renewal of that Covenant which has become weakened, if not actually broken, by those taking part in the service. The terms of that Covenant are recited, either in form of the Ten Commandments as spiritually interpreted by Jesus Christ, or else in His summary known as the Two Great Commandments. Conscience-stricken, the worshippers confess that they have fallen short in thought, word and deed in their observance of the Covenant requirements. Passages from the Book of the New Covenant are read and the Christian Creed recited — expansions and exemplifications of what the New Covenant requires. The spirit which marks this

first stage of the English Holy Communion Service is that of contrition.

(2) The second stage of the Service is concerned with commemoration. Here the worshippers recall particularly the Passion of Jesus and the institution of the Lord's Supper. Those wonderful chapters, *John* xiii-xvii, constitute the background of such a commemoration for those who have the knowledge and imagination which such recollection demands. The spirit which marks this second stage of the service is one of thanksgiving for all that Jesus and His Gospel and His Spirit have meant and must mean to mankind.

(3) The third stage of our English rite is communion with God made possible for us by Jesus Christ and His unveiling of the Divine Nature. The communion, of course, is spiritual and must be so.

> 'Speak to Him thou, for He hears,
> For Spirit with Spirit can speak;
> Nearer is He than breathing,
> Closer than hands and feet.'

But although spiritual, it is mediated in the Holy Communion Service by what our Prayer Book calls (Article XXV) 'effectual signs' or efficacious symbols of bread and wine. The Holy Communion is not dependent upon these symbols of bread and wine, for we know that in certain cases in the communion of the sick, where the sick man cannot receive the elements, he is yet taught that he has not lacked anything in the realization of spiritual communion.

To-day there appears to be a growing number of Christians whom the mediating symbols do not assist in their experience of spiritual communion, and one of the problems of Church administration is whether such people ought to be excluded from the fellowship of the Christian Church. We ourselves are convinced that a right valuation of the Christian religion forbids such exclusion. On the other hand, the Christian Church would not be justified in omitting the mediating symbols from the Service because there are some Christians who do not find them helpful.

(4) The fourth stage in our Service is that of sacrificial self-consecration. This begins as a sacrifice of thanksgiving for

Christ's sacrifice for mankind, which sacrifice is not a propitiatory expiation of sin, but a whole-hearted dedication and devotion to the will of God realized in the service of man. This is expressed in the words of the first post-Communion thanksgiving:

> 'And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee.'

These four stages, represented by the four words Covenant, Commemoration, Communion, Consecration, constitute the successive 'moments' in our English Communion Service. These four stages are successive, but they are also cumulative. As the service progresses the new stage subsumes that which precedes it, and the whole concludes with a supreme act of thanksgiving and adoration. Briefly, this represents the 'action' of our service: but what intensity and concentration are needed if the worshipper is to realize this 'action' in his own devotional experience!

BOOK REVIEWS

THE 'GOD-INTOXICATED MAN'*

When Ernest Renan spoke at the dedication of a statue of Spinoza at the Hague in 1882 he said:

> 'This man, from his granite pedestal, will point out to all men the way of blessedness, and ages hence, the cultivated traveller, passing this spot will say in his heart: "The truest vision ever had of God came, perhaps, here."'

Yet enough attention has scarcely been paid to the written work of the Jewish thinker who united in unprecedented degree the ethical vision of the prophet with the metaphysical precision of the philosopher. This is largely because of his formal method of exposition. Spinoza claimed to follow Euclid in his manner of stating propositions, proofs, and corollaries. He pursued this plan in the realm of philosophy just as the Greek had done in that of mathematics. An unfortunate decision! It has meant that a view of the world which amounts to a vision of God has to be approached through a tangled forest of logical terminology. No wonder that the adventurers are few who will push their way out towards the peak whence they may gaze at the prospect that Spinoza has discovered. In his handy volume in which order and clarity of thought are the rule Mr. Alexander Shanks has made a successful attempt to set down in a short clear essay

* *An Introduction to Spinoza's Ethic.* By Alexander Shanks. (MacMillan. 4/6. 1938.)

a constructive view of Spinoza's philosophy as a whole, and to sharpen the perspective by contrast and comparison with other thinkers.

What was it that Spinoza desired to say? Briefly, he wanted to tell us that the universe of man and nature is a part of God. He did not separate man, as observer, from the world which he sees. The infinite God, he says, exists in extension and thought, in the universe and in man's mind. The core of things, as we know them, is a relation between a finite universe and an infinite deity. Everything is explicable from this starting-point. The moral life is an increasingly more sure grasp of what is the divine reason; physical science is a progress of knowledge of the divine system.

> 'The human mind is part of the infinite intellect of God, and therefore when we say that the mind perceives this or that thing, we say nothing else than that God has this or that idea.'

Whence, then, arise evil and error? They are due to 'inadequate ideas,' to ignorance which is an activity attributable to our not fully understanding by reason what it is that we are doing.

Since the mind is a part of God, it is eternal. The more it understands the more it becomes eternal.

> 'The more advanced everyone is in this class of knowledge the more conscious he is of himself and God, that is, the more perfect and blessed he is.'

Hence, when a man has come to understand himself and the universe, he is, so to speak, more completely in God, and has what Spinoza calls 'the intellectual love of God.'

Spinoza was a Jew of Amsterdam, born in 1632, and was excommunicated from the Synagogue for his heretical opinions. His philosophy is a rationalized Judaism. It has all the points of pure Jewish faith without the postures of ritual, legalism, and superstition. In his view can be traced the concept of divine wisdom permeating the universe which we have in the wisdom literature of Alexandria. From his writings we know that he taught that the authority of the Bible rested upon its teaching of virtue and goodness: we find that he admitted the human defects of sacred writers; we learn that he saw Jesus as one in whom that blessedness which came from the intellectual love of God reached a perfection not hitherto attained which was a model for the human race. This kind of blessedness, which every individual may in some degree reach, was for Spinoza, a 'Christness,' the obedient, understanding life of one who is a 'well-beloved son.' The deficiencies of Spinoza's thought are logical. He bridges the gap between the thinker and the object and his only explanation of this relation is, so to say, his own hypothesis. Truth implies a relation between the idea and its object. But Spinoza asserts that 'the order and connection of ideas is the same as the order and connection of things.' That is to say, the idea and the object are two sides of the same identity, and this identity is a sequence having existence in God's intellect.

> 'From God's idea of his own essence there follow an infinite number of ideas, each of which is an idea of essence and existence, and each of which constitutes the essence and existence of some "thing." Thus the thing is nothing other than an idea in God's intellect' (p. 70).

It can easily be seen how we are here parting company with Kant, who showed that the make-up of the mind is such that it can understand things —their shape, relationship, causality—even though it does not know what the 'things in themselves' really are. In other words, Kant explains logically the relation of thinker to object whereas Spinoza merely traces the relation to a necessity of God's nature, which a critic might argue is merely his own view of the nature of the universe. At the same time, there are points of comparison between Kant and Spinoza, and, while Mr. Shanks has done good service in providing us with a clearly written guide to Spinoza's thought, we are inclined particularly to value the apt way in which he brings Spinoza and Kant together, and shows points of resemblance between these two thinkers. The distinction made by Kant between reason and its limits and the region of faith — God, Freedom, and Immortality — is well known. The technical terms here involved are the 'phenomenal' world, of which we have logical knowledge, and the 'noumenal' world, which is unknowable, but towards which we may take up an attitude of faith. Now Spinoza has the same kind of distinction. He recognises that the self is determined by God, but that its activity may be 'inadequate.' He sees the difference between what T. H. Green described as 'the world which is,' and 'the world which should be.' What tells us anything about the 'world which should be?' Kant answers 'the moral law.' Spinoza says: 'the admission that we have inadequate ideas,' or in other words, the fact that we can act and think aright, *viz.* have intellectual love towards God, but that passion or human deficiency restricts us in this direction. It might indeed be said that Kant's famous saying is an exact echo of Spinoza's position. 'The starry heavens above, the moral law within,' are equivalent to God extended in the scientific universe, and God in the individual mind. Spinoza gives a definitely Christian turn to his scheme when he asserts that the more we understand the universe and the more we obey the divine law the more 'blessed' we become. 'That we should be called the sons of God.' What Spinoza fails to show is the force of 'oughtness' in moral conduct. 'I ought, therefore I can' — Kant's explanation—has no place in 'intellectual love' as the Jewish thinker sees the situation. In order to meet the need for getting beyond 'inadequate ideas' — the 'ought-nots' of thought and conduct — Spinoza propounded what he called 'A correction of the Understanding,' which was an unfinished sequel to his 'Ethics.' 'Attention must be paid,' he says, 'to moral philosophy, to the education of children, to medicine, and to mechanics. Everyone will see that by this means I wish to direct all sciences to attain the greatest possible human perfection.' We may, however, notice

a very interesting point when we have Spinoza and Kant together. Spinoza tells us that we live rightly when we understand ourselves as part of God, and nature as part of his infinite being. Kant, without starting with God as his major premiss, tells us that each individual is under duty, and this duty, of course, includes an injunction to each of us to know facts that are relevant to our station in life. Thus we can conceivably reach a similar position of human perfection *via* Kant to that which Spinoza envisages, except that Spinoza asserts that this position is 'intellectual love of God' whereas for Kant it would be complete obedience to the moral law. What is the difference? Simply, that Spinoza assumes that the individual is determined in relation to the good life under God, while Kant sees the good life as a matter of free choice and effort on the individual's part. But, as Mr. Shanks points out, what we consider a free act may, when it is done, be no more than what is divinely determined. There is a similar relation between the two philosophers in their metaphysical standpoint. For Spinoza outside objects are 'substance,' a part of God; 'extension' is 'God.' For Kant the outside object, the 'thing-in-itself,' is unknowable. The essence of the thing may be God or it may not. Kant leaves this point problematical. Both Spinoza and Kant, that is to say, find an inner necessity in external objects — the reality behind the appearance — but Kant preserves a metaphysical freedom of opinion as to whether or not the thing-in-itself is a form of divine activity, whereas Spinoza conceives of the thing-in-itself as 'extension,' *viz.* 'of God's being.' Here again, as in the ethical sphere, what we are free to conceive of may in truth be what Spinoza says it is, just as what we are free to do rightly may, in reality, be what God determines for us.

The reader who comes to know the thinker of Amsterdam better from Mr. Shanks' introduction will be inclined to agree that 'Spinoza's philosophy, in spite of its logical errors, may be of more worth than one which lacked the inconsistences.' The fact is, as the writer says, 'that no such philosophy exists.' The genius of Spinoza consists in his compromise between the head and the heart, between reason and sentiment. If it be true, as Plato held, and as Dr. Inge has reminded our modern age, that no philosophy can exist without an element of myth—without some prophetic vision of that towards which logic points—then in the 'Ethic' we have the two aspects inseparably blended into a harmony that appeals to the intellect even while it stirs emotion as well; and the 'God-intoxicated man' gives us a logic which kindles high desire at the same time as it imparts inward light. Herein lay the inspiration which, the author points out, came from Spinoza to the English Romantic poets. A short bibliography might have been added to this book for the benefit of the notice and to link it up with the other literature on the subject.

J. R. McCallum.

DOMESTICITIES OF LITTLE GIDDING*

Dr. Blackstone has thrown fresh light on the famous community of Little Gidding by the publication of a selection of letters in the possession of Magdalene College, Cambridge. These have been chosen from the vast collection of miscellaneous papers bequeathed to that College by Dr. Peckard.

Of the Founder of Little Gidding Dr. Blackstone writes in his Introduction to this volume:

> 'Nicholas Ferrar holds a distinguished place in the annals of the Church of England. He took no part in the ecclesiastical politics of his day, he abhorred controversy and declined preferment: yet in singleness of vision and completeness of achievement he stands as the most original genius in the Church during the vital period of her post-Reformation history. He is known as a man of affairs, as a saint and as a legislator of the devotional life. The community which he founded at Little Gidding was dispersed and had no permanent successor; but its ideals have left an indelible impression on the tradition of Anglican piety' (p. xi).

The community lived at Little Gidding for twenty years (it was broken up by the Puritanical iconoclasts in the winter of 1646) and the papers which Dr. Blackstone has gathered into one volume were mostly written within that period. He describes it as 'a manual of the spiritual life in action.' The papers are all very different from each other yet they 'possess an inner unity of motive.'

Dr. Blackstone's Notes on the various manuscripts are of great interest and especially the Note on 'the Little Academy.'

> 'It was a clearing house for ideas, a means of spiritual refreshment and recreation: and, above all, it offered opportunities for creative activity. Individual differences, which had been to some extent suppressed in the quiet round of community life, could here be recognized and discussed. The fruits of individual experience, reading, and meditation, could be compared, and given their due place in the synthesis of the Dialogues' (p. 97).

The aim of the Academy was the attainment of perfection, and perfection was to be attained through knowledge of the truth.

> 'Finding in themselves, and observing in others that doe sincerely pursue vertue, that the greatest barre of Perfection was Ignorance of the truth . . . they determined with firme promises each to other to make a particular survey of those opinions and practizes which the world recommends or disallows, weighing them not in the scales of common Judgement, but of true and right Reason . . . .' (p. 98).

A great number of these letters were written by Nicholas, and others by John Ferrar, his elder brother, who became head of the Community when Nicholas died. Others are written by Mary and Anna, daughters of

* *The Ferrar Papers*, containing *A Life of Nicholas Ferrar, The Winding Sheet.* A Collection of *Short Moral Histories* and a Selection of Family Letters. Edited by B. Blackstone M.A., Ph.D. (C.U.P. 21/-. 1938.)

Susanna Collet, who give reasons for their determination to lead celibate lives. In this resolution they were encouraged by their Uncle Nicholas and their parents reluctantly gave way to his judgment, though they would have liked Anna to marry Arthur Woodnoth. It was Arthur Woodnoth whom George Herbert (of Bemerton) appointed his executor. To Nicholas Ferrar (who wrote the Preface to *The Temple*) Arthur Woodnoth wrote in Mach 1633:

> In the Name of Christ Iesus my Lord.
> Reuerent Sr,
> Yppon friday about foure a Clock itt pleased God to take Vnto his mercy the soule of or Deere Deere Brother and frend mr Harbert—whose body Vppon Sunday was buried the more particular passages of his Sicknes Death and buriall I shall giue yu an accoumpt His will He made but Vppon munday before hee dyed and the most imperfect act that Euer he did to proue wch I shall not neede to say more then this He hath made mee his executor . . . (p. 276).

In a letter to his Mother, signed 'your distressfull pore Sonne,' Richard Ferrar, who has got into debt, writes:

> 'I doe desier you for Christ Iesus sake not to lett your pore Sonne to goe to a Iayle, there to ly, dy and Rott:'
> 'I doe beseech you Deare Mother lett me not bee a Newgate bird and soe for ever to loose my liberty and fortunes' (p. 278).

In one letter John Ferrar mentions 'Mr. Cromwell' of whom the Editor says in a footnote:

> 'The reference is almost certainly to Oliver Cromwell. The family is known to have been in serious financial difficulties at this time; in the next year 1627, Sir Oliver Cromwell, uncle to the great Oliver, was forced to sell the family mansion at Hinchinbrooke. I have not been able to trace what connection the Ferrars had with Cromwell at this time' (p. 247).

Other letters from John complain to Nicholas of the behaviour of his second wife, Bathsheba (p. 280), and Nicholas, the bachelor, gives his brother advice how to manage her. He continues his good services in that direction by begging his uncle, Arthur Woodnoth, a goldsmith in London, who was to be in charge of Bathsheba on one of her return journeys, to take the opportunity of talking severely to his companion:

> 'And bee not now neither shy nor sparing to giue her a sound and playne admonition of what you thinke and know necessary for her to heare and practize Which though it will bee perhaps to you troublesom to giue and to her bitter to receiue yett it will bee profitable both to her by way of preparation for righter disposed thoughts and to you for the performance of a necessary duty' (p. 256).

Bathsheba (Owen) evidently did not take kindly to Community life and her desperate need to get to London and the difficulties of transport are fully described in a long letter from her son John to his wife Ann.

When temper and feeling became uncontrollable it was the custom of the Ferrar brothers to produce pen and paper and have it all put down in

black and white so that the affair could be quietly considered. So John writes to Nicholas:

> 'And what Ever yeat there was that troubled her in this or in any other thing lett her give me notise of it in writing and I would to the uttermost of my power Seeke her Content as my promise hath binne and my mind Still is' (p. 280).
>
> 'In Bathsheba, an entirely new personage appears on the Gidding stage; a personage of most inconvenient and intractable vitality. Her husband omits all mention of her from the *Life*; she has been a mere name for three hundred years; but a reading of these letters will show that she was one of the most important figures of Little Gidding, on whose whim depended in large measure the smooth working of that intricate machinery of holy living. Bathsheba was a spirit of the earth, earthy; it is pitiful to imagine what the life at Gidding must have been to her' (p. 225).

In one of her letters Bathsheba maintains that before Mrs. Ferrar died that to Bathsheba had been assigned the management of the household. One wonders how much of it there was to manage while Nicholas lived, for he seems to have done all the household shopping even to buying the women's clothes.

> 'Concerning the disposall of the greene perpetuana[1] I wish that they may all have petticoates of it. for which and for a gowne for mee I suppose it will suffice for the Mercer saith three breadths will bee enough for a petticoate — as for sleeues I will prouide some other stuff — being desyrous That the likeness in all outward things may be a remembraunce and motiue to there Indeauour of perfect Inward Unity and agreement amongst the sisters —
>
> Insteade of Statute Lace I sende you downe silke and more there is diing black. It coms to litle more then the statute — But being likely to last much Longer I suppose it much better and though because it is not in fashion the mercer partes with it at halfe the price yett with you I suppose it will bee in that regard nothing at all the worse — Wherfore both for Petticoates and sleeues you shall haue more — and enough —
>
> For Ioyce I am loth to lay out mony on a new Coate her mothers petticoate will perhapps fitt her for the present. And the boys may bee suplied out of Annas and Peggs petticoates yf you can make things serue for the present it will bee best . . .' (p. 260 *f*).

Old Mrs. Ferrar died in 1634, and the Founder, her son Nicholas, in 1637. John Ferrar died in September, 1657, and his sister Susannah Collet (related to the famous John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's) survived him little more than a week. Susannah, her daughter, who first married a Mapletoft and then a Chedley, died three weeks after her mother. Perhaps the final dissolution of the little community was due not so much to dwindling numbers (for Susannah i had sixteen children and Susannah ii had five, while John the Elder had four) as to the management falling into the hands of outsiders. Bathsheba was evidently antipathetic to all that Little Gidding stood for, and though her son John married a wife in whom John the

[1] Perpetuana, 'a durable fabric of wool manufactured in England from the 16 c.' N.E.D.

Elder hoped to find some comfort, and a measure of that sympathy which his wife withheld from him, yet the young couple would not, or could not, live at Little Gidding. The wife of John, the Younger, was Ann, one of the daughters of Sir Th. Brook. In a letter to a friend telling of the engagement John, the Elder, wrote:

> 'this lady whoe is yett undisposed is vertuous and comely discreet and right in the good old wayes of the Church of England.'

In a letter (May 1657) after the marriage John writes of Ann as

> 'that Rich and Pretious Iewell . . . whome I Can not but call myne owne (not daughter in Law) whom vpon every days more and more Experience, Such is her lovely, discrete, vertious pyous deportment that she ravishes my harte with much loye and gaines the affections and good wishes of all freinds and strangers alsoe that See know and heare of her Actions. Happy and thrise happy is my Deare Sonne in her Consortshipp and my selfe blessed in my Old Adge to See and behould and possess this Noble Brook . . . ' (p. 304).

But as time went on John must have become increasingly disappointed in Ann judging by the following letter from Ann to her father-in-law:

> honoured Sr
>
> it would haue beene much to my comfort if my husband and my selfe might haue obtained yor consent to haue for the present liued where our judgement leades us is most for our aduantage, especially knowing wee must prouide for our selfes and pay our dets our selfes, i hope wee need not aske any ones licence how and where to doe it, neither doe I know any law of god against it, but you are pleased to declare that noe Reasons shall preuale with you in this kind and that yor endeauors shall bee to persuade us, i hope you do not think mee so weake in affares of this world as not to know a difference of places . . . seeing you was pleased to command my husband to set doune his mind in writing i desire you would bee pleased to let mee Read yor judgment on his letter, for if it can bee made euident that wee can conueniently liue by our selfes as plentifully and cheaply at gidding as ells where, heeres none will speake a word against it, but if you bee Resolutly bent not to yeild yor consent as hoping i will undertake to keepe house for any but our selfes, you must giue mee leaue freely to declare my Resolution, wich is that i will not undertake the taske upon any termes, and i hope my husband will bee soe sencible of my welfare as not to bee inclinable to it for our friends at gidding i expect noe more from them then they shall Receaue from mee god willing . . . (p. 307 *f*).

Dr. Blackstone describes the difficulty of deciphering the letters, for many are so badly written and the script is often faded, the paper stained, torn, and cut. Arthur Woodnoth's handwriting seems to be particularly bad judging by the following complaint by Nicholas (p. 229):

> 'Onely lett mee desyre you when yu write the Names of any in your Letters to putt soe much more tyme as they can be playnely reade — For other matters wee can make them upp by Sence'

There is a characteristic absence of punctuation in the letters. One of Anne's, without any date, though it covers two pages of print has no full

stop anywhere, and only an occasional comma. Her use of capitals is peculiar. Not even the first person singular has a capital, and when she does use one, it is for the sake of emphasis. Nicholas shews the same indifference for capitals and does not even give one when he mentions the Deity, though he gives one to himself in the middle of a sentence:

> 'In the greate shower which was heere a gladsom hower and since god bee thanked wee haue had some more rayne but in Essex soe much as they say it is almost wynter agayne in the way, Wee hope god hath refreshed you likewyse wth this blessing—.'

The weather, as a topic of conversation, seems to have been an English custom in those days as even in ours.

M. E. Major.

PROBLEMS OF FORGIVENESS*

This interesting book is a study of the Christian doctrine of the forgiveness of sins, as seen in the New Testament, and of the later changes in the doctrine in the course of Church History. The author does not concern himself with the doctrine of the Atonement, *i.e.* the means by which God is able to forgive sins, a subject on which the literature is very extensive, but with the conditions on which the sinner may expect to receive forgiveness.

The main problem the author deals with is the relation between God's forgiveness of the sinner and the sinner's forgiveness of his fellow men. That there is a close connection between the two no one would dispute; though most scholars would probably disagree with the author's thesis that our forgiveness of others is 'the fundamental and a precedent condition of the forgiveness of God.' In favour of the author's thesis is the petition in the Lord's Prayer, 'Forgive us our debts as we also have forgiven our debtors.' But against it we have to place such texts as, 'Be ye merciful as your heavenly Father is merciful,' 'Forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you,' and 'We love Him because He first loved us,' which seem rather to indicate that God acts first, and our similar action follows after God has acted upon us. The author repeatedly asserts that man must forgive his fellow men before God can forgive him. This is an impossible condition, for we can only learn to forgive when we perceive God's forgiveness working in us. What is true is that God's forgiveness, which has begun to work in us, may be frustrated if it does not bear in us the fruit of a forgiving spirit, and this is certainly the teaching of the parable of the Unmerciful Servant. The problem of reconciling the various statements in the Gospels is very difficult. On the text, 'If he repent forgive him,' the author rightly comments, 'Does this mean that the offender is to be cast out as beyond the pale if he does not repent? Jesus did not say so. . . . If the offender does not repent, we are not to retaliate, but do all we can to win him back and to soften his heart.' Now, if that is the true

* *The Forgiveness of Sins.* By E. Basil Redlich. (T. & T. Clark. 1937. 10/6.)

Christian procedure, it must also be the way that God acts, and yet we read at the end of the parable of the Unmerciful Servant, 'So shall also my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother their trespasses,' *i.e.* that God will hand us over to torture if we do not forgive others, whereas we under similar circumstances are not to retaliate. The only possible solution of such an inconsistency is to suppose that these words about God's retaliation on the unforgiving man are a Christian preacher's attempt to emphasise the necessity of our forgiving others. They cannot be the words of Christ Himself, for they do not give a true picture of the heavenly Father. The clause in the Lord's Prayer, 'as we also have forgiven,' is probably to be explained in the same way, arising through a mistranslation of Semitic tenses.

Not only does the author fail to face these difficulties, but, in order to develop his thesis of the antecedent necessity of human forgiveness, he finds references to it in most surprising places, as *e.g.* when he finds a lesson on repentance in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, or when he says that an unforgiving spirit is an example of the state implied by the expression 'blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.' Although the author allows far too free a rein to his imagination, *e.g.* with reference to Peter's question about forgiving his brother, he says, 'Peter was troubled about a brother he had in mind; it was probably Judas Iscariot, who seemed to have led a clique among the twelve disciples.'

No one can of course exaggerate the duty of our forgiving our neighbour, but it is only one of our duties to our neighbour, the duty to care for those in trouble and sin being equally important. It is therefore distinctly misleading to say that 'Jesus lived and died to show the world its need of being forgiven and of forgiving.' The attitude to our neighbour which the Cross inculcates is something far wider than merely forgiving those who have wronged us.

The book is well worth reading for the problems it raises. The chapters on the later doctrines and practices of forgiveness in the Church are particularly interesting. But a more critical attitude in Bible study, and less insistence on one particular thesis, would have made the book far more valuable.

L. E. Browne.

THE ART OF THE TRANSLATOR *

The art of translating verse into English, once almost a branch of art in itself, is now rarely practised, especially when the original is in one of the ancient languages. Still rarer is the reverse process. In the University of London the whole output of 'Greek Iambics' comes from half-a-dozen enterprising women students, the pupils of the present reviewer. It is refreshing therefore to come upon a volume of over a hundred pages

* *Aliunde*. Translations and Verses. By Sir Alexander Lawrence. (Oxford University Press. 5/-. 1938.)

containing translations from Greek, Latin, French, German, Italian, Spanish, even Swedish, a rendering of 'The Massacre of Macpherson' into Greek hexameters — even an Italian adaptation of a Greek lyric; so many-sided is Sir Alexander Lawrence's linguistic and poetical equipment. The whole is crowned by a small collection of original English verse — mainly epigrams and satires.

It is indeed in the rendering of epigram that Sir Alexander chiefly excels as translator. What better rendering of Catullus' couplet, 'Odi et amo,' could there be than this:

'I hate her, love her. Why?
I cannot tell.
And so it is, and I
Suffer like hell.'

Simonides' famous epitaph he does equally well:

'To Sparta, friend, a message bear;
Her word was law — and we lie here.'

The same may be said of his translation of the bitter epigram by Voltaire:

'Sur un Christ habillé en Jésuite.'

When it comes to translating Lucretius or Aeschylus into blank verse the author is haunted by the ghost — not of Tennyson but of the Tennysonian imitator, weak rhythm, weak inversions, weak adjectives. Nobody could achieve Tennysonian verse except Tennyson himself, and his best work was done not in the manner of the '*Idylls*' or even '*In Memoriam*,' but in that of '*Maud*.' Why do people not study the rhythm of the Elizabethans more? If they feel the style of Shakespeare to be unattainable, and sacrilege to attempt it, then why not Webster? Why not study the Cenci — so Shakespearean in some respects?

Think of the weakness of these inversions even in a *rhymed* rendering of the Italian, in which kind Sir Alexander is usually at his best: :

'And wings upon my ankles I am bearing,
So that no man my pathway may unravel;
My forelocks spread before me I am wearing
And therewithal my face and breast I cover.'

Directly the writer, whether in translation or original verse, gets into the satirical vein, these weaknesses disappear and he becomes direct, concise, strong. This is from 'The daughter of Dora' (a satire on the erection of H.M. explosives factory at Gretna).

'The rills of her acid corrosion
Creep serpent-like over the land
To the hills where her cordite explosive
Lies billowed in bowers of sand;
In a flash all the fields of disorder
Burst forth from the kindling mass
And awaken the towns of the Border
With fountains of shivering glass.'

One would like to quote much more in this fine vein, but space forbids. Excellent also is the rendering of 'Die Trommel des Siska' into the ballad-

meter of the original. In conclusion it may be noted that the author is one of the few who have attempted successfully the difficult and elusive metre of Catullus' 'Attis,' the name of which has escaped the reviewer's memory.

G.K.

THE CHRISTIAN CHALLENGE SERIES*

The Christian Challenge Series consists of a number of attractive little volumes dealing with various aspects of Christian faith and life. They are the kind of books which can well be put into the hands of lay people. Readers of this journal will be specially interested in Professor Norman Sykes's book in this series: *The Crisis of the Reformation.* It is a book which is very relevant to the contemporary European situation, for we are unable to understand what is happening in Central Europe to-day, and especially in the Church conflict in Germany, unless we first understand the great historical movements which have shaped the present situation. Amongst these the Reformation is of the greatest significance. Canon Sykes maintains that the Reformation was something more than a political or economic or nationalist movement, although such forces were at work in it. It was not only the financial administration and the economic and political position of the Roman Church which were rebelled against: the Reformation was essentially a *religious* revolution. It was not in essence a nationalist movement, for nationalism developed sometimes independently of Protestantism (witness the France of Louis XIV); nor yet was it a religious cloak for economic change, for economic changes similar to those which took place in England, Germany and Sweden in the sixteenth century have subsequently taken place in countries untouched by Protestant doctrines. Indeed, the Reformation was not entirely a 'Protestant' movement: a brilliant chapter on the Counter-Reformation shows us that it also revolutionized the Roman Church itself.

Within the compass of so small a volume Canon Sykes has shown, with a clarity possible only to the true expert, the inner significance of Lutheranism, Calvinism and the Reformed position, and the Anglican Settlement. It would be impossible to find elsewhere for English readers so concise a statement of the true meaning of the Continental Reformation; yet perhaps the most interesting chapter in this instructive book is that entitled 'Anglicanism and the Reformation in England.' Those who are interested to-day in the subject of the Parish Communion, and the relationship of the Liturgy to social living, will be very interested in what is said of our Reformers' ideal of a weekly Communion:

> 'The ideal of the English Reformers, as of Calvin himself, in respect of public worship was the assembling of the Church every Sunday for the service of Holy Communion. The Anglican Prayer Books embodied explicity the standard of the unity of the homiletic and

**The Christian Challenge Series.* John Heritage. (The Unicorn Press, Ltd. 3/6 each volume.)

> liturgical elements in the Eucharist, at which alone provision was made for the preaching of a sermon. The prescription of special collect, epistle and gospel for each Sunday of the Christian year enforced further their intention ; and thus the Word and Sacrament were united. But the conservatism of the laity in adhering to their mediaeval custom of infrequent communion frustrated the Reformers. . . . The frustration of the ideal of the Reformers in divine service of the fusion of the didactic or hortatory with the liturgical elements in worship was the most serious failure of the Reformation, in England as elsewhere ' (pp. 127-129).

With the fullest confidence we may recommend this book, which, though small in size, contains the essence of the whole matter. Professor Sykes has a remarkable power of compressing all the facts into a very small compass without distorting them, bringing out their true significance. The intricacies of Reformation theology are made wonderfully clear ; and the style is so lucid and attractive that the reader's interest in the subject increases with every page he reads.

God's Demand and Man's Response, by the Rev. Alec R. Vidler (in the same series), consists of addresses delivered in St. Mary's, Oxford, during the Mission to the University held early in 1938. The book preserves the intimate, personal touch of the spoken word, and it forms a useful work to put into the hands of thoughtful young people who wish to know what Christianity has to say in the context of our present troubled age. Herein lies the strength of Fr. Vidler's book. It is not just another presentation of the old familiar arguments and appeals: it is an attempt to give an interpretation of the meaning of the Christian faith in the context of our present historical situation. This is what is really important in presenting the faith to modern people: they do not nowadays ask, ' Is Christianity intellectually respectable? ' but ' Does Christianity meet the needs of the modern world—more adequately, for instance, than Nationalism? ' Fr. Vidler writes as one who reached years of discretion in the years of ' generous and facile idealism ' directly after the Great War, when he also was ' captivated by the prospect of building a new world order.' He speaks of the disillusionment of the following years: ' we saw through things then which at first we had thought were solid, and we trod the path of scepticism to its bitter futile end ' (p. 11). His book is an attempt at recovery from that position: he is engaged, in D. H. Lawrence's phrase, in ' putting the right things back.' This does not mean reaction to some old infallibility, the acceptance of ' some fixed and final ideology with a dictatorial leader who will deliver you from the life-long responsibility of individual judgment and of personal decision ' (p. 12). Christianity is not presented as ' a programme for mass action or as a panacea for the world's troubles of the kind that needs only your vote and your acquiescence,' but as a message which ' claims to shine in its own light; . . . if you look at it in its full range and coherence and with a really open mind, it will commend itself to

your own free judgment. At least, if it does not do that, it would rather not impose itself upon you in any other way.' Fr. Vidler does not preach any 'reduced version of Christianity,' and 'Christianity gone pale,' but 'the Gospel of Christ in its full and authentic integrity.' He invites us to see it 'not as a way of escape from the problems of the world, but as a way of deep insight and hard action which will give you a faith that is capable of meeting and conquering the disillusion which in the end besets the devotee of every other creed' (p. 14). Fr. Vidler has given us a book which challenges all conventional acceptance of Christianity and which leads us to a new understanding of the meaning of evangelism in the modern world.

Christian Moral Conduct, by Dr. A. E. Garvie (in the same series), will hardly appeal to the same set of readers as Fr. Vidler's book. It does not discuss ethical questions from the point of view of those immersed in the complexities of the modern situation, or even from the point of view of the young men in college who sit up into the night discussing endlessly the problems of our world, but rather from the point of view of that unfortunate minority of young men who attempt the Ethics paper in the General Ordination Examination. Indeed, for the purpose of the latter examination, it would be hard to find a better text-book; all the right questions are raised and all the right answers are given and all the 'isms' are explained. One or two quotations might make the general outlook of the book clearer than a page of commentary; *e.g.*

> 'So near is God to man that in morality as in religion what appears the human discovery is the divine disclosure' (p. 31).
>
> 'The Christian ideal of the Kingdom of God, the law of which is love, can be only gradually realised "in the fulness of time"' (p. 35).
>
> 'While fully recognising the limits of Humanism, the Christian moralist should take a more appreciative attitude to it, when it is at its best, as less opposed to the Christian standard than are some of the competing systems, such as Communism or Fascism, set on earthly things' (p. 43).

In fact, a Christianized liberal humanism has become (as the last quotation shows) a 'category' or pair of spectacles through which Dr. Garvie sees everything. Incidentally, this last quotation contains the only reference to Communism or Fascism given in the index. One of the main differences between the younger and the older generation to-day is that the former believe that the main issues in politics are ethical.

God, Creation and Revelation, by Dr. A. J. MacDonald (in the same series), contains the substance of his first two series of Boyle Lectures (1935 and 1936). The first part of the book summarises the attitude of contemporary scientists (especially Jeans, Eddington and J. B. S. Haldane) and shows that the structure of the natural world offers evidence for the existence of God. The classical arguments are also considered. The second part deals with such questions as Revelation and the Nature of Jesus. Dr. MacDonald stands firmly on the liberal side of the contemporary

'ideological' fence; he believes in Progress (p. 27) and Progressive Revelation (*cf.* the concluding pages of the book, which ends by remarking that if Jesus came to earth again to-day He would probably find it desirable to revise the Sermon on the Mount).

The Church in the Ancient World, by Dr. L. E. Eliott-Binns (in the same series), deals with the first three centuries of the Church's life. Dr. Elliott-Binns is a deservedly well-known writer and teacher of Church history, and the idea of this little book is a good one; by examining the achievement of the Church in the ancient world, especially in the social and ethical sphere, he keeps clearly before us the importance of the Church's task in the world in every age. It is Church history written as a Christian challenge to the world of this and every age. The book deserves to be widely used.

ALAN RICHARDSON.

A NEW VIEW OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES*

The view, held by only a few critics, that the Pastoral Epistles are genuinely and authentically Pauline in their present form was made extremely difficult by the publication of *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* by Dr. P. N. Harrison in 1921. Dr. Harrison's chief strength was his exhaustive and masterly analysis of the language of the epistles.

This work of Dr. Harrison forms a very important part of Sir Robert Falconer's discussion in the introduction to his edition of the Pastoral Epistles, but the two scholars do not agree as to the dates of the various letters. A crucial point is the chronological relation of the Epistles to *I Clement.* While Dr. Harrison and Dr. Streeter thought it probable that the editor of the Pastorals borrowed from *I Clement,* Falconer argues that linguistic study shows that the Pastorals represented a type of language shared by *Luke-Acts, Hebrews, I Peter* and *Clement,* the language of the higher Κοινή, which covered so wide a period that it is no basis for determining the priority of the Pastorals or Clement. Accordingly, on the ground that in Clement the ministry of the church and its history are more definitely formalized than in the Pastorals and that it is difficult to believe that the Pastorals came between Clement and Ignatius, Falconer suggests that the Pastorals must have been known to Clement and therefore existed not later than 90 A.D.

In dealing with each separate Epistle Falconer treats them in the order of the amount of Pauline material which each contains. *II Timothy* is the most Pauline. This is really two epistles, the first, *II Timothy* (A.) (*II Tim.* i, 1—ii, 13, iv), being saturated with Pauline thought, the only occasion for doubt of Pauline authorship being the occurrence of a few non-Pauline words. Falconer sees in the language an affinity with Luke

**The Pastoral Epistles.* Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Sir Robert Falconer, K.C.M.G.; D.Litt. and Hon. D.D. (Edin.); Hon. D.C.L. (Oxon); Hon. LL.D. (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1937. 12/6.)

and concludes that 'the simplest explanation of this combination of Pauline substance with Lucan expressions is that Luke, who was with Paul (iv, 11), was his secretary and reproduced the essential letter which Paul dictated.'

This is an attractive theory, but dictation surely implies that not some but *all* the words would be Pauline. Further, if it be desired to argue at least Lucan influence on Pauline material, it must not be forgotten that the analysis reveals that of the words which give rise to suspicion eighteen are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, and while fourteen out of twenty-one other non-Pauline words occur also in *Luke-Acts*, of the further 'Lucan' parallels which form part of the argument, and for which references are given, twenty-five are from *Acts* and only three from *Luke*. This would of course be largely accounted for by difference in subject-matter, but we expect here at least a note on the Lucan authorship of *Acts*; but no indication is given as to the writer's views on this subject, whether he thinks that Luke wrote the whole or, as Prof. Nock, for instance, has recently given as his opinion, only a part.

An interesting attempt to reconstruct the later history of St. Paul is made in order to find the right place for *II Timothy* (A.) and incidentally for the cores of the other Epistles. It is accepted as a possibility that St. Paul was acquitted at his earlier trial and made another journey in the East, abandoning his project to visit the West owing to the situation in the Eastern Churches, a journey from which he returned as, or shortly to be made, a prisoner more closely held and in a more threatening position than before. From prison he writes *II Timothy* (A.), and when Timothy obeys the summons he instructs him verbally in terms afterwards written down by Timothy and forming the substance of *II Timothy* (B.), which was later worked up by a follower of Timothy.

In *Titus* Falconer finds genuine and forceful Pauline teaching expressed often in non-Pauline words, with echoes of the language and moral ideas of the Hellenistic world. This 'leads to the view that the letter contains Pauline doctrine transmitted by Titus.' He further suggests that the doctrine is probably what Titus heard Paul preach in Crete, perhaps in the early summer of 56, when Paul may have gone there from Ephesus and met Titus on the latter's return from carrying *II Corinthians* to Corinth.

In *I Timothy* there are Pauline ideas in unfamiliar terms, but also non-Pauline ideas, for example, the attitude to the Law, and the ruling idea of εὐσέβεια. The Epistle was apparently constructed from blocks of materials of different origins, by the hand which edited the other Pastorals, there being in this Epistle considerable additions. Falconer places the date soon after *Acts*, though the references to Timothy and other matters are later.

This edition is a valuable contribution to the subject. Serious criticism will respect the conclusions reached even though it cannot always agree with the conclusions or the arguments, and adverse criticism may well be confined to the arrangement, which, though in many ways admirable,

might have been improved if, in the Introduction after the first three sections, each of the four Epistles (counting the two halves of *II Timothy* as separate works) had been treated in a section of its own, with sub-sections on Pauline and other material, Structure, Occasion and Purpose, instead of making a separate section for each of these subjects and thus being compelled to treat each epistle three times, once under each head, an arrangement making for unnecessary repetition and breaking up the line of argument.

There are four good essays on εὐσέβεια, Forms of Error, Church Organization, and Church Worship.

In the Translation and Notes the extent to which different hands have been laid on the material of the Pastorals and to which they are composite is strikingly shown, the following elements being clearly distinguished by the type employed: A Pauline Letter, Pauline Base, A Christian Fragment on Church Order, A Christian Prophecy, An Authoritative Tractate on Christian Piety and Church Order, and Redactions by the Editor of the Pastorals. But it is not always clear why the divisions have been made where they have, and this part of the work is likely to be regarded as the most debatable; for, while it may be granted that these various elements are to be found in the Epistles, it is very difficult to decide on all the points where one begins and the other ends.

The reader's first impression of the translation is that in general style it approaches too closely the suavity of an essay, but closer acquaintance reveals that this is due to the great care which has been taken to find the right translation of every word, there being so many unusual words in these epistles. A comparison with Dr. Moffatt's translation shows very substantial agreement, and any discrepancy between the two is usually extremely instructive, the notes (which without being too long show wide reading) always giving ample support in any difficult passage.

This edition is clearly to some extent a controversial one, but all will allow that it is a careful, very thorough and very illuminating study of its subject which no serious student will be able to neglect.

A. R. C. Leaney.

GERMAN PASTORS IN PRISON*

Much has appeared in the English Press about the struggle of the Confessional Church against Nazidom. Pastor Niemöller is famous, but it is not so well known that not less than 1,300 pastors have been in prison, some more than once. One can now learn the feelings of some of these men from their own pens. Last year some of their letters were collected and printed for private circulation: 20,000 copies had been sold before the Secret Police confiscated the book; but a copy found its way to England, and is here translated into English.

* *I was in Prison.* (S.C.M. 1938. 1/-.)

These letters are a noble record of Christians suffering for their faith. Although prison life is hard, these men escape the extremes of Nazi brutality, because in prison they are protected by the law, as those in concentration camps are not. One pastor writes:

> 'It was such a pleasure for me to get the marmalade. Till now—only dry bread. I enjoyed it immensely. To put some marmalade on my bread strikes me now almost as an extravagance.'

And another:

> 'It is quite good for our old Adam to have to bend for a time, to learn once more to value dry bread, to have to do without smoking for a time, to be called "thou" by a convict.'

And another:

> 'I am really getting on quite well. The hardest thing for an old officer is the humiliation of being under arrest.'

All speak of the consolation they find in reading the Bible and in prayer. The New Testament promises Christians joy in God, but in this world suffering and persecution. So one pastor writes:

> 'It is most wonderful to read the Bible at such a time. How alive it suddenly becomes, and how real. It really gives the impression of having been written for prisoners and for prisons. And so it is really.'

And again:

> 'The tales about imprisonment in the *Acts* and the *Epistles* are specially apt and realistic. . . . Only in these days have I realised how much it is taken for granted as a matter of course in *Acts* xxiv.27, where it is written of the imprisonment of Paul in Caesarea "But after two years"—just as if it were nothing.'

The pastors one and all are sure that they are suffering in Christ's cause; and their faith in Him upholds them in their hardships.

> 'I have become certain of one thing . . . that it is not our cause, but the cause of Our Lord Jesus Christ which is at stake.'

But they show no resentment or bitterness towards the Government which is persecuting them. There is one book of the New Testament, and that the least Christian, of which there are no echoes in these letters, the *Apocalypse*. Some of them insist that Christians should be entirely loyal citizens.

> 'Even under such circumstances as the present, Christians must preserve their loyalty as citizens, and the New Testament whenever it refers to such circumstances never does so with the slightest bitterness but always in the spirit of joy.'

One does not know whether all the pastors feel the same. These letters have had to pass the censorship of the prison governor. All show a wonderful Christian patience, forgiveness and joy. But are some of them resolved to overturn the Nazi *régime* if they get the chance? If not, then some in this country will judge them to be examples of German docility, which bears oppression too easily, and has so often caused Germans to allow themselves to be ruled by brutes.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

AFTER THIS MANNER PRAY YE*

Two little books entitled *The Lord's Prayer* and *Our Father* are attempts to teach the Divine method of prayer. Brother Lawrence in his practising of the Presence of God realized that combination of quantity and quality in prayer that Canon Anson stresses in his latest book.

> 'It is not until we cease to judge prayer by quantity and begin to value it by its quality, as a true and continuous ascent into the mind of God, for ourselves, for others, and for the world, that we come to know how prayer lies at the centre of the life of the soul.'

This was Fénelon's view: 'As soon as we are with God in faith and in love, we are at prayer.'

Mr. V. D. Davis in his little book *The Lord's Prayer* strikingly presents the same lesson.

> 'Prayer is going into the Silence . . . to receive from God the deeper impulses of spiritual being, and to answer faithfully to their appeal.'

This going into the Silence will remind some of the words of Thomas à Kempis: 'Silence is the nutriment of devotion.'

which leads Fénelon to complain:

> 'How rare it is to find a soul quiet enough to hear God speak'!

'Teach us we pray,
To be silent before Thee'

is one of John Hoyland's requisites for effective prayer. It is in this silence as Mr. Davis points out, that we secure

> 'that awareness of the other greater Life, enfolding, penetrating and sustaining ours' (p. 9).

Mr. Davis' book contains many helpful quotations from Whichcote, Whittier, George Fox, Isaac Penington, Rufus Jones, Auguste Sabatier, Robert Barclay and other well-known Christian mystics.

Mr. Davis' book is written for older people. Mr. Snow's book *Our Father,* is written

> 'to help young people to understand and practise their religion . . . and shows that true prayer transforms the pray-er into something more like what God meant him to be.'

Or as Mrs. Herman expresses it:

> 'to elucidate the meaning and value of prayer as a creative process, whereby the man who prays and his world are made anew.'

In describing the stages of prayer which most children go through, Mr. Snow remarks that with some people the child's way of praying lasts them through life whilst with others it leads them to give up prayer altogether. Mr. Snow asks questions which he answers simply and sincerely. For instance:

> 'What is the point of praying? . . .
>
> 'The point of Prayer is to *change your life:* through Prayer you will try *to make your life different, to make your life what God wants it to become'* (p. 10).
>
> 'What . . . is the Will of God?' . . .
>
> 'The Will of God is the Purpose that God has for each human life.'

* *The Lord's Prayer.* By V. D. Davis, B.A. (Lindsey Press. 1/-. 1938.)
Our Father. By George Snow. (S.P.C.K. 2/-. 1938.)

The following remarks illustrate the sanity of Mr. Snow's teaching about prayer:

'Prayer is thinking with God, thinking in God's presence.'[1]

'It is an interesting thought that God is actually nearer to us than He would be if we could see Him.'

'Prayer's chief aim is to keep life on the move—to keep life from day to day moving along the road of God's service, daily becoming more and more what God wants it to be, a life that God can use for the building of His Kingdom.'

'Prayer which once we thought was a way of asking for things for ourselves we now see to be just the very reverse.'

This book succeeds in teaching what it sets out to teach, and that is, how to pray. It points out heights, but to attain those heights the lowlands must be first traversed. M.E.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

SIR, DR. RAWLINSON AND LORD HUGH CECIL.

Your comment seems to me, if you will allow me to say so, a little unfair to Lord Hugh Cecil. What he says about the stability of the Creed is, of course, erroneous; but however much we may disagree with him doctrinally, and however wrong we may consider his idea of the way in which the doctrinal situation should be handled, we must, I think, endorse his condemnation of the present ecclesiastical policy.

That policy is no doubt dictated by the desire to keep the Church in being, and it is reasonably certain that the course advocated by Lord Hugh Cecil would bring the Church to an abrupt end. He does not, we must agree with Dr. Rawlinson, give due weight to the difficulty and complexity of the situation.

On the other hand, Lord Hugh Cecil is surely right in thinking that doctrinal pharisaism 'enervates the Church and destroys its evangelistic power.' Sunday by Sunday, in half the churches in the land, clergymen are reciting 'precise and weighty statements of the creeds' while conscious that they do not really believe them. The contention that they believe them 'symbolically' deceives no one; least of all themselves. Can we wonder that the more enlightened and conscientious of the laity are leaving the Church in ever-increasing numbers, and can we doubt what the result of that must be?

Dr. Rawlinson refers to page 39 of the Doctrinal Report. What the Report says in effect is: 'We must recite the Creed, but we need not believe it.' What it ought to have said is: 'We must revise the Creed.' Dr. Rashdall long ago pointed out that the Lambeth Conference would have as much authority to promulgate a new Creed as the Council of Nicaea had. The desideratum is a formula truly catholic; that is to say, a formula to which all who profess and call themselves Christians can assent. This condition is perhaps fulfilled by Sir W. Moberly's three 'central affirmations' of Christianity: 'The sovereignty and fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the eternal destiny of the human soul.' The ad-

[1] 'A great master of the spiritual life said: "I have learnt to meditate by taking a verse of the Gospels, or a truth of the faith, and thinking it over with God."'

W. J. KNOX LITTLE.

vantage of this formula is that while it proclaims the great principles that Jesus Christ supremely symbolises, it makes no direct reference to Him or to the nature of His person; and the plain truth is that you cannot frame any statement about the nature of our Lord's person that is not controversial. Naturally, no one who does not feel His attractiveness, nor wishes to follow Him, will desire to be a member of the Church; but debatable matters, such as the Incarnation, the Virgin Birth, and the Resurrection of the Body, must be rigidly excluded from the *canon* of faith, and relegated to the domain of individual exegesis.

When once the credal question is settled, the liturgical should offer little difficulty. We cannot expect, nor should we desire, liturgical uniformity.

J. C. GRAHAM.

Morvah Cottage, Portloe, S. Cornwall.
2nd March, 1939.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CUP AT HOLY COMMUNION.

SIR,

This problem has been of great interest to us for many years. My husband, the late Rev. C. P. G. Rose, M.A., B.D., R.N., discovered many people abstained from communicating because of the use of a common cup. (Does this in any way account for the shrinkage of Easter communicants, which amounts to 93,213 in three years?) For more than twelve years he used the small individual cups, both in the Navy and after he retired. Many people thanked him for so doing, and Chatham Dockyard Church congregation presented him with a set of cups on leaving. Since his death, we, who have this feeling of delicacy, would be entirely cut off from attending Holy Communion in the Church of England if it were not for the kindness of a friend who holds a special service occasionally for us. Cannot the Church do something about it?

M. CECILIA ROSE.

Cobhambury, Cobham, Kent.
3rd March, 1939.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

SIR,

I am grateful to the Rev. T. F. Royds for the information contained in his letter in the February *Modern Churchman*. My authority for the suggested alteration in the last verse of the *Te Deum* was 'The Teacher's Prayer Book,' by the Rt. Rev. Alfred Barry, D.D., D.C.L. After an analysis of the hymn he writes: 'There are a few mistranslations which slightly detract from the beauty of the original: (1) *v.* 1 should begin "We praise Thee as God"; . . . and (5) in *v.* 29 we should probably read, "I shall never be confounded" (non confundar in æternum).'

But, whether the Prayer Book translation of it is correct or not, I should like to see the last verse of the *Te Deum* altered, as suggested by Dr. Barry, especially as different versions exist and we surely ought to choose the most Christian for use in Christian worship. As the verse stands it is an insult to God. We might say to a friend, if we could risk offending him, 'I have trusted in you; don't let me down'; but such an attitude to God is, or ought to be, impossible. God could not possibly betray our trust, though we may sometimes, in the depths of despair, be tempted to think He does. Why then use words, even from the Old Testament, which imply He might? And in a Christian service, too!

Could not Old Testament literature be, where necessary, adapted, not merely adopted, for Christian use in the spirit of Christ's words in the

Sermon on the Mount, 'It *was* said . . . but I say . . .'? Why not act on this principle and leave out the imprecatory verses of certain psalms, etc.? I believe this is even now in the power of any Vicar to do, but it seems a power very seldom exercised.

I entirely agree with the first paragraph of Mr. Milner's letter in the February *Modern Churchman,* and feel sure that he has hit on a very real reason for the non-attendance at church of many thinking people. Even to lifelong Church-goers the Prayer Book is marred in parts by insincere or unsuitable language, which makes them hesitate to invite strangers, who may be repelled by it, to the ordinary services of the Church. Ought we, for instance, to pray 'We beseech Thee leave us not comfortless,' though the Collects are usually the best part of the Prayer Book? Or 'Be not angry with us for ever'; or say to the sick Churchman 'Whatsoever your sickness is, know you certainly it is God's visitation'? Whenever did Jesus say anything like this?

As regards Mr. Milner's remarks on supplicatory prayer, it seems to me that, as it is quite right and natural for a child to ask for whatever it wants, relying implicitly on its father's understanding love to give it only what is good for it, so should we adopt this attitude of frank trust to God, our Heavenly Father, who 'knoweth that we have need of all these things' before we ask Him, and 'without whom not a sparrow falls to the ground.'

We should all agree with Mrs. Prynne on the need for humility, but this is not cultivated by exaggerated or insincere expressions of it. Job, who refused to confess a guilt he did not feel, was 'justified rather than his friends,' who urged him to confess. St. Paul distrusted himself, not God. We all need forgiveness, but what could be more natural or confident than the petition for it in the Lord's Prayer, a petition which is that of a child, not that of a servant or slave. There is no 'beseech' in the Lord's Prayer.

We must not indulge in remorse as a luxury; we must not 'put sin on a pedestal and then walk round it and view it on every side and so magnify it into a mountain that hides God from our eyes.' We must trust that 'if we confess our sin, He is *faithful* and *just* to forgive us our sin, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness' (*I John* i, 9).

Any who have taught children know how difficult it is to reach those whom unhappy circumstances have rendered servile, and reserved, as sometimes happens. Confidence and frankness must be established before any good can be done. How can God teach and help us unless we really trust Him, for without trust there is no religion?

I think there can be no doubt that some of the language of the Prayer Book *is* psychologically unhelpful, and, whatever reforms are, or are not, carried out, Modernists should try to get this altered.

E. E. Hart.

10 Roydstone Road, Bradford, Yorks.
28th February, 1939.

Sir,

As my Note for Prayer Rook Revision (in your November issue) seems to have been misunderstood in some quarters; may I, please, just explain briefly that I did not mean, for one moment, to suggest that 'affirmations,' in our worship, should be expressions of confidence in our own spiritual attainment but in God's infinite mercy, goodness and love, with assured reliance on His promised help and protection; a very different thing from that attitude of assuming 'that the fight is over and the battle won,' objected to, quite justifiably, by your correspondent, K. Prynne.

But, while I agree with Mr. Milner that 'the essential nature of prayer is being revealed . . . as concentration of the attention upon God,' I also hold, with you, Sir, that supplicatory prayer is in accordance with our Lord's example and teaching and has its place in our worship, and I would not wish to see it entirely ruled out. But He told us when we pray, to believe that we have the things that we ask for. Moreover, unlike so many of those in our Prayer Book, the petitions in the Lord's Prayer, including that for forgiveness, are put in the form of simple, trusting claims, such as children might make upon a Father's love and care, rather than imploring cries for mercy as from subjects to an offended Sovereign Ruler.

I would add that such prayers as the Collects for the Sixth and Seventh Sundays after Trinity are examples of the type of which I, for one, would like to see many more in our Liturgy, combining as they do affirmatory with supplicatory prayer of the kind our Lord Himself taught us to offer.

ROSA C. VINE.

Edge House,
Stroud, Gloucester.
February 17th, 1939.

THE BODILY RESURRECTION OF JESUS—NO MIRACLE.

SIR,

Dr. Mason in his book, *The Faith of the Gospel,* published some fifty years ago, set forth the thesis that if man had continued in the upward evolutionary progress of organic life instead of turning aside in what we call 'The Fall,' he would have reached such a state of perfection that his method of passing into the spirit world would not have been by death but by some kind of natural translation. One man, the sinless Jesus, did reach such a stage of perfection, and Dr. Mason suggested that His transfiguration marks the time when His translation into the spirit world was due—but He chose instead to come down from the Mount to suffer for our redemption. Two points in the account of the Transfiguration are worth noticing. (1) The subject of conversation with Moses and Elias was the way in which Jesus would finish His earthly life, 'the Exodus which He would accomplish at Jerusalem.' (2) Jesus' order to the three disciples to 'tell no man what they had seen till the Son of Man should be risen from the dead.' His words are meant to teach us that there is a connection between His Transfiguration and His Resurrection, the one throwing light on the other, for at His Resurrection He stood where He had been on the mount of Transfiguration. The unnatural and in that sense miraculous thing was not His Resurrection but His death. Death was not the natural ending to a sinless life, and could only have been brought about by violence. But after such an unnatural break up of His sinless human organism it may well be that what we call His Resurrection was the natural and inevitable climax. If the full significance of Jesus' injunction to His disciples to 'tell no man till . . . ' etc., has not been recognised till 1900 years later, we have here an instance of the Providence of God in preserving these words, which had apparently little or no meaning for those who wrote them down.

R. A. HITCHCOCK.

Beccles.

CORRECTION.

Investigation indicates that on p. 580 (*M.C.* February) we have done St. Jerome an injustice. Although the Clementine Vulgate, the Bible of the Roman Church, contains I *John* v, 8 ('The Three Heavenly Witnesses'), St. Jerome himself did not include this passage in his Vulgate.—ED. *M.C.*